

The Instruction of Youth in Late Imperial Russia: *Vospitanie* in the Cadet School and Classical
Gymnasium, 1863-1894

Andrew J. Ringlee

A thesis submitted to the faculty of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in partial
fulfillment of the degree of Master of Arts in the Department of History

Chapel Hill
2010

Approved by:

Louise McReynolds

Donald J. Raleigh

Wayne E. Lee

ABSTRACT

Andrew J. Ringlee

The Instruction of Youth in Late Imperial Russia: *Vospitanie* in the Cadet School and Classical Gymnasium, 1863-1894

(Under the direction of Louise McReynolds)

This thesis uses memoir and pedagogical literature to juxtapose the experiences of students who attended two different types of secondary school – the cadet school and the classical gymnasium – in Russia during the reigns of Alexander II (1855-1881) and Alexander III (1881-1894). It examines how students and teachers evaluated educational policies by the Ministries of War and Education during a period of reform and reaction. Seeking to train an independently minded officer and ensure loyalty to the autocratic state, the Russian Ministry of War paid great attention to providing its students with an ideal school experience centered on familial relations between teachers and students, progressive pedagogical innovations, and extracurricular activities. In contrast to the Ministry of War, the Ministry of Education viewed its students' political attitudes with suspicion and attempted to limit their exposure to radical thought through the teaching of classical languages and the classroom use of rote memorization and stern disciplinary measures. As a result of these two different approaches to secondary education, former military cadets professed loyalty to their alma maters for having provided them with an ideal schoolhouse environment and youth experience, while former civilian students decried the Ministry of Education's efforts to shape them and upheld self-education as the necessary supplement for the incomplete instruction they had received in the classroom.

Table of Contents

Chapter I.	The Instruction of Youth in Late Imperial Russia: <i>Vospitanie</i> in the Cadet School and Classical Gymnasium, 1863-1894.....	1
	Introduction.....	1
	Secondary Education in Russia, 1856-1894.....	10
	Academics.....	17
	Teachers and School Administrators.....	23
	Discipline.....	34
	Sex and the Danger of Losing Control.....	39
	Leisure Activities.....	44
	Conclusion.....	59
Works Cited.....		63

The Instruction of Youth in Late Imperial Russia: *Vospitanie* in the Cadet School and Classical Gymnasium, 1863-1894

In December 1960, a group of aging men, dressed in their best suits or tuxedos and accompanied by their wives and children, congregated in an assembly hall in San Francisco, California. Surviving photographs show the men lined up in smart ranks and singing together. Behind them, large, painted cardboard epaulettes hung on the walls. A Russian Orthodox priest presided over the ceremony and offered a blessing, while a portrait of Emperor Nicholas II served as a secular icon to which the celebrants directed their reverence. The group drank toasts to their comrades present and fallen, and, once the solemnities concluded, an orchestra picked up a tune, and the dancing and revelry began. The local press and important Californians failed to notice this seemingly innocuous gathering. But, for those present at the assembly of the United Cadet Association (*Obshchee-kadetskoe Ob''edinenie*), the event marked the endurance of the loyal sons of a vanished empire. This assembly was not an attempt to recreate for a fleeting moment the Russia that once existed. True, this group convened to remember the past, but they remembered it in order to affirm the camaraderie, attention to duty, and love for tsar and motherland that each member had learned in military boarding schools at least forty years prior to the meeting.

This reunion of former cadets is significant because it evinces that the Ministry of War succeeded in instilling school pride and a corporate identity among the students who studied in the cadet schools.¹ Thousands of graduates from the Ministry of Education's secondary schools

¹ The cadet schools (*kadetskie korpusa*) were renamed the military gymnasia (*voennye gimnazii*) as part of the reforms of these institutions beginning in 1863. In 1882, the military gymnasia were renamed the cadet schools (*kadetskie korpusa*) as part of the new series of reforms introduced under Alexander III (1881-1894). For the purpose of this essay, I refer to the institutions of military secondary education as the cadet schools, unless I am discussing a specific school during the period whose name bore the military gymnasium title (1863-1881).

emigrated from Russia after 1917 as well, but these former students did not form alumni associations or congregate with each other in public ceremonies later in life. This essay compares the educational strategies employed by the Ministry of War and Ministry of Education during the reigns of Alexander II and Alexander III to see how participants experienced studying in two types of institution: the military cadet school and the civilian classical gymnasium. These two types of institution differ because they were under the auspices of different bureaucratic ministries and most cadets boarded at school, while civilian secondary school students lived in either dormitories or at home. Former students frequently commended or denounced their alma maters for the upbringing—*vospitanie*—which these schools provided them. Former cadets advocated on behalf of the Ministry of War’s educational project because they believed that they had benefitted from it. Conversely, students who studied in civilian classical gymnasia tended to castigate their former schools and teachers. Graduates from civilian schools received *vospitanie*, but they learned it on their own, in opposition to the way that the Ministry of Education tried to mold them. As a result of this difference, years later, former cadets as far away as California expressed loyalty to their alma maters, while graduates of civilian secondary schools conveyed no warm feelings toward their gymnasia.

Vospitanie is one of the many Russian words that has no equivalent in English. Aleksei Ostrogorskii, the editor of the imperial Russian journal for military educational institutions, *Pedagogicheskii sbornik* (Pedagogical Collection), explored the differences between *vospitanie* and *obrazovanie*, or “education,” in his lengthy essay, “Vospitanie i obrazovanie,” published in 1897. Drawing on the works of some of the most famous nineteenth-century Russian thinkers, Ostrogorskii summed up the two concepts as “*Obrazovanie* gives a person knowledge, skills, capabilities for intellectual work, an understanding of the relation between cause and event, the ability to generalize, a system of knowledge and so forth. *Vospitanie* regards the behavior of a

person, his relations to others, his worldview.”² For Ostrogorskii, *vospitanie* developed convictions, character, and will, a process that began in the home and continued at school. Since many Russian cadets boarded at school, *vospitanie* became a vital concept for pedagogues in military schools who took on the responsibility of raising children.

Ostrogorskii’s article cites the leading nineteenth-century Russian works on *vospitanie*, and these different views represent the ways that nineteenth-century students and teachers understood the word. Lev Tolstoi emphasized its forced, disciplinary nature, writing, “*vospitanie* is the influence of one on the other . . . a way of life, punishment, teaching, the management of life’s influences.”³ The founder of Russian scientific pedagogy, Konstantin Ushinskii (1824-1871), influenced by Romanticism, emphasized *vospitanie*’s national peculiarities. “Every nation has its own variant of *vospitanie*,” Ushinskii wrote, “which lies in its own special idea about how a person should be according to the understanding of the people (*narod*).” In order to find the true Russian *vospitanie*, the subconscious characteristics that every good Russian should possess, Ushinskii recommended looking at literature, folk tales, proverbs, and religious texts.⁴ For Ushinskii, *vospitanie* appears to have been the indoctrination of the individual into a cultural milieu.

Many of the great Russian writers of the middle of the nineteenth century, influenced by the civic ideals of the French Revolution, the ephemeral optimism of the Revolutions of 1848, and the progressive feelings of the Great Reform-era (1855-81), maintained that *vospitanie* played a political function in addition to its disciplinary and cultural roles. Nikolai Pirogov, the

² Ostrogorskii cites the writer Lev Tolstoi, the surgeon and pedagogue Nikolai Pirogov, the pedagogue Konstantin Ushinskii, the social critic Vissarion Belinskii, and many lesser known figures in his work. See Aleksei Ostrogorskii, “Vospitanie i obrazovanie,” in *A. N. Ostrogorskii: izbrannye pedagogicheskie sochineniia*, ed. M. I. Kondakov (Moscow: Pedagogika, 1985): 205-71.

³ *Ibid.*, 209.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 212-13.

physician-hero of Sevastopol (1854-1855) and favorite pedagogue of the military reformers, believed that *vospitanie* led to knowledge of the self and its role in society. He wrote,

The final goal of proper *vospitanie* should be a child's gradual awareness of the surrounding world, that is, the times in which he will have to act. This is most important. This understanding should lead to the formation of a child's awareness of truth and kindness. And the ultimate task of *vospitanie* . . . should be the gradual formation of modern moral convictions, the formation of a free and firm will, which results in the *vospitanie* of citizenship and human valor, and serves as the best characteristic of a society and a historical period.⁵

Although he never lived to see the Great Reforms, the literary critic Vissarion Belinskii, stressed that educational institutions needed to place greater weight on *vospitanie*. "Parents alone have the sacred obligation of turning children into people (*sdelat' detei chelovekami*)," but "the purpose of educational institutions is to turn them into scholars, citizens, and members of the state."⁶ Vladimir Stoiunin, another pedagogue and writer, believed that *vospitanie* "develops a sense of moral connection between society and people (*s obshchestvom i s narodom*)."

Vospitanie's duty was to support the laws and quell arbitrariness (*proizvol*), a task that began in the academic curriculum with the scientific study of history and literature.⁷ Physical conditioning of the body through exercise and the teaching of hygiene served as a final aspects of Russian *vospitanie*. This essay examines the Ministry of War's and Ministry of Education's attempts to provide *vospitanie* for their students and explore how the students themselves assessed the success of the two ministries' efforts to mold them into useful members of state and society.

This essay considers John R. Gillis's theoretical framework for describing the Western European creation of adolescence as a stage in life between childhood and adulthood to show that imperial Russia followed Western European educational and cultural trends. Gillis argues that "low mortality and low fertility made adolescence possible, but the real crucible of the age-

⁵ Ibid., 224-25.

⁶ Ibid., 241.

⁷ Ibid., 244-8.

group's social and psychological qualities was the elite secondary school.”⁸ The nineteenth-century British public school, according to Gillis, did the best job of supervising youth's vitality by providing extracurricular activities for young people. In Britain, by playing at politics in debating societies or playing at war on the soccer field, parents delayed their children's entrance into the world of real politics and conflict.⁹ Gillis views the development of a space for adolescents as a mark of modernity. Germany, in which the middle-class family, instead of the gymnasium, controlled social learning, failed to develop the notion of adolescence and struggled to compel youth to conform to elite goals.¹⁰ My essay posits that Russia accords with the historical trends in secondary education and youth in both Britain and Germany, albeit the onset of the Russian experience is slightly delayed from that in the West. The Russian classical gymnasium closely resembled its German counterpart in academic structure and experience. The Russian cadet school, with its familial relations between teachers and pupils and its emphasis on extracurricular activities, such as arts and crafts, gymnastics, and music, followed the British public school's model for educational institutions. Differences among these four types of institutions existed, but it is my argument that the Russian military promoted the modern notion of adolescence in its cadet schools beginning in the 1860s, while the Ministry of Education simultaneously struggled with directing the young people in its own institutions toward politically useful ends.

The primary sources for this study are a body of memoirs written by former students who attended cadet and civilian secondary schools during the reigns of Alexander II (1855-1881) and Alexander III (1881-1894). Since there are few available memoirs from this period by cadet school graduates, I have consulted two lengthy memoirs written by former pedagogues who

⁸ John R. Gillis, *Youth and History: Tradition and Change in European Age Relations, 1770-Present* (New York: Academic, 1974), 105.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 108.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 117-18.

taught and administered military secondary schools during this period. These types of sources act as representatives of a peculiar cultural development in late Imperial Russia, the proliferation of memoir writing. As the Russian literary scholar Beth Holmgren has argued, the nineteenth-century flowering of Russian literary talent and the rise of the professional classes encouraged a large number of Russian elites to record their personal experiences on paper and publish these works in “thick” journals, the same literary forum in which the major works of nineteenth-century Russian literature first appeared.¹¹ The educated elite devoured these journals, and the fictitious stories and articles on political, social, scientific, and literary topics published in them made up the enlightened public discourse in late imperial Russia.¹² According to Holmgren, when a former student or teacher published their memories in one of these serials, they took up the pen of Tolstoi and assumed the same right and ability of the great authors to identify Russia’s ills and prescribe treatments.¹³

The most important type of source for this essay are the student memoirs that describe their teachers, their academic experiences, and the leisure activities that they participated in at school. These accounts appeared in specialized thick journals, such as *Ruskaia shkola* (Russian School) and *Pedagogicheskii sbornik*. These works praise or lambaste the educational system in which the authors studied and, by doing so in a public forum, the authors advocated in favor of a humane, student-centered secondary school. Examples of this type of work for the military schools are the anonymous author Z---ov, who published his memoir in *Pedagogicheskii sbornik* in 1907, and I. V. Pavlov, who published his recollections in *Voennyi mir* (Military World) in

¹¹ Beth Holmgren, ed. *The Russian Memoir: History and Literature* (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 2003), xxi.

¹² Joan Delaney Grossman, “Rise and Decline of the ‘Literary’ Journal: 1880-1917,” in *Literary Journals in Imperial Russia*, Deborah A. Martinsen, ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1997), 172.

¹³ Holmgren, *The Russian Memoir*, xxi.

1913.¹⁴ In terms of civilian educational institutions, Ivan Poroshin attended four different civilian secondary schools during the late 1870s and early 1880s. Vladimir Shimkevich also attended a civilian gymnasium during the 1860s and 1870s. Both of these accounts appeared in 1905 and 1906 in *Russkaia shkola*, and each one testifies to the disheartening environment at the civilian classical gymnasia and its detrimental effects on the physical and psychological health of Russia's youth. The timing of these publications at the turn of the century is important, because the rapid changes in the Russian social landscape that came as a result of industrialization and urbanization and the expansion of secondary education caused many members of educated society to worry about the seemingly licentious, irrational behavior of Russian youth. These authors reflected on their own life stories in order to identify alternatives that might protect Russia's younger generation from the ills of modernity.

Lieutenant-General Nikolai Andreevich Iakubovich and General Major Vladimir Georgievich von Bool' spent their careers as teachers and administrators in the cadet schools, and their works represent the teacher memoirs.¹⁵ These lengthy recollections were published in *Russkaia starina* (Russian Antiquity), a historical journal devoted to publishing memoirs, diaries, and autobiographies of political, military, and cultural figures from eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Russia. The readers of *Russkaia starina* probably had many of the same characteristics as Iakubovich and von Bool': male, educated, conservative, and mature. Iakubovich and von Bool' both graduated from pre-reform cadet schools and returned to these institutions to work as pedagogues later in life. Both authors agreed that reform was necessary in the cadet schools in the early 1860s, although they disagreed whether the reforms that the Minister of War Dmitrii

¹⁴ N. Z---ov, "Iz vospominanii o Vladimirskei Kievskoi Voennoi Gimnazii," *Pedagogicheskii sbornik* (January 1907): 56-71; (June 1907): 523-38; I. V. Pavlov, "Vospominanie o Sibirskoi Voennoi Gimnazii, 1870-1876," *Voennyi mir* (June-July, 1913): 32-59.

¹⁵ See N. A. Iakubovich, "Letopis' i mysli starogo pedagoga," pts. 1-6, *Russkaia starina* 154 (June 1913): 607-23; 155 (July 1913): 124-38; 155 (August 1913): 341-52; 156 (October 1913): 161-80; 158 (June 1914): 615-22; 159 (July 1914): 110-80 and V. G. von Bool', "Vospominanie pedagoga," pts. 1-8, *Russkaia starina* 117 (March 1904): 615-30; 118 (April 1904): 111-23; 118 (May 1904): 379-92; 119 (July 1904): 213-27; 119 (August 1904): 287-305; 119 (September 1904): 578-93; 120 (October 1904): 74-101; 120 (November 1904): 300-48.

Miliutin introduced in 1863 benefitted the cadets studying in these institutions at the time. Even though Iakubovich and von Bool' presented opposing views on the Great Reforms, in the end, they both agreed that individual pedagogues played important roles in creating a modern, student-friendly system of *vospitanie* in the cadet schools.

The final type of memoir used in this essay is the revolutionary memoir, which proposed the overthrow of the autocracy as the solution to Russia's problems. Following the example of Alexander Herzen, the revolutionary memoir was typically written abroad, after its author had gone into exile for underground political activities. This type of account described how experiencing and witnessing repression at the hands of the political regime inspired revolutionary consciousness in its author. Peter Kropotkin's, Leon Trotsky's, and Mikhail Ashenbrunner's memoirs are examples of the revolutionary memoir. These radicals did not set pen to paper with the sole intention of discussing pedagogical problems, but they all described similar experiences at school that caused them to question the world around them. Methodologically these authors' strong disposition to criticize tsarist Russia presents problems for the historian interested in the nature of Russian secondary education. However, much of the information on school experiences that these works relate can be corroborated by the two other types of memoir. In fact, there is remarkably consistency in the tropes and details that the three types of school memoir recount.

Western scholars who have written on civilian education in Russia primarily have been concerned with evaluating how well the tsarist government implemented educational policies to modernize the empire while preserving the autocracy. These scholars sought to explain why a country with a comprehensive, Western system of education that produced some of the best minds in the world failed to convince graduates of the benefit of maintaining the autocracy that imploded in war and revolution in 1917. Most authors see Dmitrii Tolstoi, minister of education from 1866 to 1880, as the central figure in the development of Russian education during the late imperial period. Under Tolstoi's administration the number of educational institutions increased greatly, but the curricula and rigid bureaucratic discipline employed in these institutions as

cautionary measures against the development of radical thought drove many students and teachers to despair.¹⁶ Historians have used student memoirs to evaluate why the civilian schools were unpopular, but they have given greater attention to the in-class lessons taught to the pupils than the more elusive socialization effects that schooling had on Russia's youth.¹⁷

Russian and Western scholarly works on the imperial institutions of military secondary education frequently repeat what nineteenth-century reformers said about these schools. Contemporary observers and later historians agree that the cadet schools prior to the Great Reforms were unprofessional, noble institutions. The reforms introduced by the progressive Minister of War Dmitrii Miliutin in 1863 modernized and professionalized these institutions and lessened the military character present within these schools. Alexander III introduced counter reforms to the cadet schools, and these changes refocused the cadets towards military service but did not restore the pre-1863 character to these institutions.¹⁸ This essay adds a new dimension to

¹⁶Nicholas Hans, *History of Russian Education Policy* (New York: Russell, 1964), 114; Allen Sinel, *The Classroom and the Chancellery: State Educational Reform under Count Dmitry Tolstoi* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1973), 173. For a discussion of the Ministry of Education's plans for developing a comprehensive program for studying literature in Russian secondary schools, see Andy Byford, "Between Literary Education and Academic Learning: the Study of Literature at Secondary School in late Imperial Russia (1860s-1880s)," *History of Education* 33, no. 6 (2004): 637-60.

¹⁷ See Sinel, *The Classroom and the Chancellery*, 171-213; Rebecca Friedman, *Masculinity, Autocracy, and the Russian University* (New York: Palgrave, 2005); Deborah Howard, "Elite Secondary Education in Late Imperial Russia" (Ph.D. diss., Indiana University 2006), 234-78.

¹⁸ For works on military secondary schools in late imperial Russia, see N. V. Alpatov, "Voennye gimnazii v Rossii," *Sovetskaia pedagogika* (July 1945): 28-34; idem., *Uchebno-vospitatel'naia rabota v dorevoliutsionnoi shkole internatnogo tipa* (Moscow: Ministerstva prosveshcheniia, 1958); Petr A. Zaionchkovskii, *Voennye reformy 1860-1870 godov v Rossii* (Moscow: Moskovskii universitet, 1952); idem., *Samoderzhavie i russkaia armii na rubezhe XIX-XX stoletie* (Moscow: Mysl', 1973); Forrestt Miller, *Dmitrii Miliutin and the Reform Era in Russia* (Nashville: Vanderbilt, 1968); Jacob Kipp, "The Grand Duke Konstantin Nikolaevich and the Epoch of the Great Reforms, 1855-1866" (Ph.D. diss., Pennsylvania State University, 1970); Iu. Galushko and A. Kolesnikov, *Shkola rossiiskogo ofitserstva* (Moscow: Russkii mir, 1993); A. A. Mikhailov, *Rukovodstvo voennym obrazovaniem v Rossii vo vtoroi polovine XIX – nachale XX veka* (Pskov: Pskovskii oblastnoi institute povysheniia kvalifikatsii rabotnikov obrazovaniia, 1999).

works on Russian education by contrasting the experience of attending a civilian and military secondary school during the reigns of Alexander II and Alexander III. My particular focus will be on how former students and teachers articulated different notions of *vospitanie* that these schools provided for their students.

Secondary Education in Russia, 1856-1894

At the end of the Crimean War (1853-56), the development of Russian education lagged behind the Western powers and threatened to undermine the empire's position among the European great powers. In 1855, Russia maintained seventy-seven gymnasiums for boys training 17,817 students, twenty-one cadet schools for the army, training an additional 8,004 cadets, and a few dozen clerical seminaries and technical institutes.¹⁹ The education level of the masses was even bleaker and, despite the new tsar-reformer Alexander II's personal interest in education, the government enacted no significant measures in educational policy during the first six years of his reign (1855-61). Instead, the public took the lead under the guidance of the surgeon Nikolai I. Pirogov's "*Voprosy zhizni*" (Questions of Life), published in the Ministry of the Navy's journal *Morskoi sbornik* (Naval Collection) in 1856, which argued in favor of the utilitarian benefit of general education for the individual. As curator of the Odessa and Kiev districts from 1856 to 1861, Pirogov expanded the educational opportunities for all social estates and won the support of Russian high society. In the relatively liberal atmosphere of the 1860s, university students began to question the political authorities, and the disorders they created motivated the tsar to name Alexander Golovin as the new minister of education. Golovin was the personal confidant of the Grand Duke Konstantin Nikolaevich, who reformed the navy's education institutions according to Pirogov's suggestions. During Golovin's tenure as minister of education, he greatly increased access to education and improved the professional quality of the institutions that provided it. The

¹⁹ Hans, *The History of Russian Educational Policy*, 235-237; See also Sinel, *The Classroom and the Chancellery*, 24-25; Patrick Alston, *Education and the State in Tsarist Russia* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1969), 42-44.

autocracy reversed its liberal attitude toward education following the student-radical Dmitrii Karakozov's 1866 attempt on the tsar's life, which compelled the autocrat to awaken to the danger of student terrorist movements. In response to this act of defiance, the tsar replaced Golovin with his chief critic, Dmitrii Tolstoi, who approached public enlightenment with a more apprehensive view of the political challenges that it posed for the modernizing state.

Tolstoi's dilemma was how to organize the gymnasia to produce competent personnel who would serve the state but not question the autocracy. In order to achieve these goals, he looked to classical languages, Latin and Greek, as tools for disciplining male secondary school students' minds while at the same time keeping the younger generation too preoccupied to question the world around them.²⁰ Tolstoi's reasoning was not atypical for Europe at the time, nor was it novel for Russia. Greek and Latin were widely regarded as essential staples of boys' education on the continent and in Britain, and both languages were taught in elite Russian schools prior to Tolstoi's 1871 Gymnasium Statute.²¹ The classics kept youth grounded in the ancient world, which was regarded as the height of man's achievement and the foundation of European civilization.²² Tolstoi greatly increased the number of ancient language lessons taught per week in the Russian classical gymnasium and instituted entrance exams that made it more difficult for lower-class children, whose parents could not afford private tutors, to gain admission to these institutions.²³ He also sought to curb students' access to radical influences by forbidding outside books in school, banning student associations, overburdening students with schoolwork, and instituting surveillance apparatuses in student dorms and apartments. Under Tolstoi, the classroom tutor (*vospitatel'*), formerly a school employee in charge of *vospitanie* who helped

²⁰ Alston, *Education and the State in Tsarist Russia* 88, 96-97; Sinel, *The Classroom and the Chancellery*, 130-31.

²¹ John Chandos, *Boys Together: English Public Schools 1800-1864* (London: Hutchinson, 1984), 32-33.

²² Sinel, *The Classroom and the Chancellery*, 131.

²³ *Ibid.*, 175.

students with their schoolwork and mediated on their behalf if the workload was too intense, was replaced by the classroom monitor (*nastavnik* or *nadziratel'*). The Ministry of Education directed the classroom monitor to spied on the students, ensuring that their political loyalties were unquestionable and their behavior was in accordance with strict directives from St. Petersburg. Despite similarities in curriculum, the Russian classical gymnasium differed starkly from the British public school, whose pedagogical philosophy focused on developing character and leadership skills through close relations with teachers, elaborate systems of student rule, team sports, and extracurricular activities.²⁴ Tolstoi configured Russian secondary schools to deny the pupil any agency in his own education and to snuff out independent thought and actions.

Teachers suffered as a result of Tolstoi's reforms as well. The Ministry of Education trusted its teachers as little as it did its students, and subjected instructors to state surveillance and strict codes of conduct.²⁵ Orders from St. Petersburg discouraged pedagogical innovations, instilled the lecture as the only way to conduct class, and limited the time for student questions in order to prevent discussions and debates. Tolstoi, who viewed success in purely quantitative terms, believed that he had fulfilled his duties as minister of education because he doubled the number of secondary schools in Russia during the seven-year period following the 1871 Gymnasium Reform.²⁶

Tolstoi's strict measures failed to win him supporters within the Council of Ministers and the autocracy's unease about the increase in student unrest at the universities led the emperor to replace the Minister of Education with the liberal Andrei Saburov in 1880. Following the assassination of Alexander II in 1881, Alexander III, by many accounts a man of limited perspective, but one who possessed a steadfast conviction in Russia's three pillars of

²⁴ Chondos, *Boys Together*, 25-27.

²⁵ Allen Sinel, "Count Dmitrii Tolstoi and the Preparation of Russian School Teachers," *Canadian Slavic Studies* 3, no. 2 (1969): 254-56.

²⁶ *Idem*, *The Classroom and the Chancellery*, 202-3.

conservatism—orthodoxy, autocracy, and nationality—succeeded to the throne.²⁷ For Alexander III, a liberal minister of education was unacceptable, and the new minister of education, I. D. Delianov, began his tenure by reinstating the most stringent adherence to Tolstoi's 1874 regulations, and thus resulted in stricter monitoring of student behavior and more frequent use of expulsion for minor infractions. Delianov's major innovation was his 1887 decree that forbade the sons of lower-class parents from entering secondary schools. Some scholars even claim that the educational policies of Alexander III retarded the development of education in Russia by limiting access to education and causing a quantitative decrease in the number of spaces available in the gymnasia.²⁸ During the reign of Nicholas II (1894-1917), the Ministry of Education introduced improvements to the Tolstoi classical gymnasium designed to lessen the reliance on classical languages and improve conditions for students and teachers.

Military education during the period of the Great Reforms and counter reforms (1881-1894) followed a different course of development because it was under the auspices of the Ministry of War. Under Nicholas I, the cadet schools (*kadetskie korpusa*) trained the sons of the gentry for future entry into the military as officers. Following the Crimean debacle, critics from within the military drew attention to the low quality of the military and general education of cadet school graduates and to the enormous financial burden that supporting these schools caused the Russian state.²⁹ Contemporary witnesses complained that these schools subjected children to the standards of military discipline from a young age and grouped the cadets into mixed-age

²⁷ P. A. Zaionchkovskii, *The Russian Autocracy in Crisis, 1878-1882*, trans. Gary M. Hamburg (Gulf Breeze: Academic International, 1979), 190; Hans, 140-2; Howard, 306-8.

²⁸ Idem, *The Russian Autocracy under Alexander III*, trans. David R. Jones (Gulf Breeze: Academic, 1976), 226; Hans, 145-8; Hugh Seton-Watson, *The Russian Empire, 1801-1917* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1967); Howard, 307-8.

²⁹ S. G. Stroganov, "Zapiska general-adiutanta S. G. Stroganov po voprosu o preobrazovanii voenno-uchebnykh zavedenii," in *Stoletie voennogo ministerstva, 1802-1902*, ed. D. A. Skalon (St. Petersburg), X, part III, 200; Dmitrii Miliutin, "Zapiska general-adiutanta gr. D. A. Miliutina po voprosu o preobrazovanii voenno-uchebnykh zavedenii," in *Stoletie voennogo ministerstva, 1802-1902*, ed. D. A. Skalon (St. Petersburg), X, part III, 188 and 190.

companies, requiring the same physical demands for cadets of different ages. The pre-reform cadet schools employed officer-instructors without pedagogical training, and critics believed the academic curriculum did not correspond to the needs of young minds and the schools did not install the correct military ethos.³⁰

Visionary military reformers, such as Dmitrii Miliutin, the Minister of War from 1861 to 1881, recognized these shortcomings and the pressing need to revitalize the military following the defeat in the Crimean War. However, when military reformers drew up plans for improving national defense, they tailored the designs to include Russian society into their military project. Historian Joshua Sanborn has drawn attention to the modernizing and nation-building influence that Miliutin's 1874 Universal Conscription Reform had on Russian society as a whole.³¹ Under the conditions of this act, peasant conscripts who had received a primary education were assigned a shorter tenure in the ranks, an innovation that drove the peasantry into elementary schools. The Miliutin reforms in officer education created a system that required secondary and specialized education for entry into the officer corps and raised the quality of the institutions of military education to accord with Western European standards. At the same time, the Miliutin educational system centered on the correct *vospitanie* of youth, and this focus is what made the system modern. This essay argues that the Miliutin institutions of military secondary education attempted to create a new type of well-rounded, critically thinking individual, and this project contrasts starkly with civilian secondary schools, whose students felt stifled and weakened by the authoritarian Ministry of Education.

³⁰ M. Iu. Ashenbrenner, *Voennaia organizatsiia narodnoi voli i drugie vospominaniia*. ed. S. Tiutcheva (Moscow, 1924), 2-4; Von Bool', "Vospominanie," *Russkaia starina*, 118 (May 1904), 379-82; idem., *Russkaia starina* 119 (August 1913), 297-8; Iakubovich, "Letopis'," *Russkaia starina* 154 (June 1913), 607-8;

³¹ Joshua A. Sanborn, *Drafting the Russian Nation: Military Conscription, Total War, and Mass Politics, 1905-1925* (DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 2003).

Beginning in 1863, the Ministry of War reformed the cadet schools, renaming them the military gymnasia (*voennye gimnazii*), which employed an academic curriculum similar to that of the real schools (*grazhdanskii real'nye gimnazii*), modeled after the Prussian *Realschulen*. This curriculum differed from that of the classical gymnasium because it was based on mathematics and modern languages. At first the reformed cadet schools were supposed to be temporary institutions that would be turned over to the Ministry of Education once the remaining students had graduated; however, sometime in the late 1860s, Miliutin decided that the Ministry of War would maintain these institutions permanently.³² Several scholars point out that the Ministry of War employed a reformed educational program and new pedagogical methods in these schools, which were more progressive than those employed in the Russian civilian schools during the reform era.³³ Military pedagogues placed particular emphasis on independent study and extracurricular activities. This pedagogical system in many ways resembled the “child-centered” pedagogy and disciplinary strategies that historian Ben Eklof describes in Russian peasant schools of the same period.³⁴ It seems that inside the military—the most coercive and

³² Miliutin claimed that he continued the support for the military gymnasia because “the Ministry of War was sure that it was unable to rely on filling its special-military schools with youth who had received their general education in the civilian schools.” See Dmitrii Miliutin, *Vospominaniia, 1865-1867*, ed. L. G. Zakharova (Moscow: Rosspen, 2005), 189. In addition, the maintenance of rival general education schools, not under the purview of the Ministry of Education, worked as a convenient snub for Miliutin’s hated rival, Count Dmitrii Tolstoi. Further evidence for this rivalry is that Miliutin personally stipulated that applicants to the professional military schools (*voennye uchilishcha*) would not be disqualified if they had failed their examinations in classical languages at a classical gymnasium, an obvious disregard for the significance Tolstoi placed on the study of Greek and Latin. See A. I. Piskunov, ed., *Ocherki istorii shkoly i pedagogicheskoi mysli narodov SSSR: vtoraia polovina XIX veka* (Moscow: Pedagogika, 1976), 140-1; Miller, *Dmitrii Miliutin and the Reform Era in Russia*, 128-9. In Miliutin’s diary, the words “argument” (*spor*), “heated argument” (*goriachyi spor*), and “to speak angrily” (*govorit' goriacho*) are ubiquitous within the references to Tolstoi. See D. A. Miliutin, *Dnevnik I*, ed. P. A. Zaionchkovskii (Moscow: Gosdarstvennaia ordena Lenina biblioteka SSSR, 1947), 79, 82, 104, 105, 108-9.

³³ Zaionchkovskii, *Voennye reformy*, 359; Alpatov, “Voennye gimnazii v Rossii,” 32; idem., *Uchebno-vospitatel'naia rabota*, 130-71; Miller, *Dmitrii Miliutin and the Reform Era in Russia*, 88-141; A. A. Mikhailov, *Rukovodstvo*, 234-304; John W. Steinberg, “D. A. Miliutin’s Impact on the Education of Russian Military Officers,” in *The Making of Russian History: Society, Culture and the Politics of Modern Russia*, ed. John W. Steinberg (Bloomington: Slavica), 23-46.

³⁴ Ben Eklof, “Worlds in Conflict: Patriarchal Authority, Discipline and the Russian School,

authoritarian of institutions—bureaucrats, enlightened by the possibilities of the Great Reforms, implemented educational policies designed to appeal to children.

Miliutin also freed cadets from having to learn military subjects such as fortifications until they finished their general education. Graduates of the military gymnasias were expected to continue their education in new, specialized, two-year military schools (*voennye uchilishcha*) and then receive their commissions upon completion. In theory, this educational system should have worked well; in reality, too many graduates from the military secondary schools used their education to enter universities or scientific or trade institutes instead of continuing on in the specialized military schools. And this movement of qualified students away from service forced the military schools to admit junker volunteers, noncommissioned officers who had distinguished themselves in the ranks but possessed less certain educational backgrounds, in order to fill all of the available spaces in the professional officer training institutions.³⁵

Following Alexander II's death and Miliutin's resignation in 1881, and in response to conservative critics who cited a lack of physical strength and an insincere attitude toward military service among the military gymnasium graduates, the Ministry of War transformed the military secondary schools back into the cadet schools. Gradual changes in these institutions during the 1880s excluded non-nobles from admission, replaced civilian teachers with military officers, and reintroduced military discipline and the teaching of military subjects.³⁶ Soviet era-scholars readily labeled these changes reactionary counter reforms, but this designation is inaccurate because the reformed academic curriculum and emphasis on extracurricular activities, the most important innovations introduced by Miliutin, remained in place in these institutions until the end of the old regime. This essay compares students' and pedagogues' experiences regarding academics, teachers and administrators, disciplinary policies, sex, and leisure activities in civilian

1861-1914," *Slavic Review* 50, no. 4 (Winter 1991), 795.

³⁵ M. Lalaev, *Istoricheskii ocherk voenno-uchebnykh zavedenii* (St. Petersburg, 1880), 254.

³⁶ Zaionchkovskii, *Samoderzhavie i russkaia armia*, 295-297.

and military secondary schools. In each section the goals of and policies by the Ministries of Education and War are weighed against the memories of students and teachers who studied and taught in these institutions.

Academics

The differences between the way that cadet and civilian secondary school students described their academic experiences are essential for appraising contemporaries' views on the usefulness of the different types of curricula in late imperial Russia. Former cadets were less vocal about their experiences in the classroom than the civilian students, but this reservation most likely suggests tacit approval of the academic course in the cadet schools, especially when it is compared with the contempt leveled on the teaching of classical languages in the Ministry of Education's schools. Since cadets frequently described school-sponsored, extracurricular activities with great affinity, they probably found classroom academics to be the less important aspect of *vospitanie*. However, former cadets refused to admonish the Ministry of War for what it insisted they learn in the classroom, and this difference helps to explain why military secondary education enjoyed popularity in late imperial Russia.

Seeking to train an independently minded, critically thinking individual who could engage the modern world, the military secondary schools' curriculum privileged mathematics, modern languages, and the natural sciences. The Ministry of War's goal for cadets was to recognize the laws of nature through observation. Iakubovich believed that this would "develop intellect and feeling in children without the encumbrance of memorization."³⁷ Another former teacher recalled that the Second Moscow Military Gymnasium's goal of *vospitanie* was "to create a broadly developed individual in physical, intellectual, and moral terms." This type of school "raised neither soldiers nor artisans but people." This author labeled the Second Moscow

³⁷ Ibid., 162-4.

Military Gymnasium a “*Miliutinskaia*” type, which “differed from the classical Tolstoi-type because of its heartfelt benevolence to the pupils.” He added that this benevolence compelled the students to love their institution.³⁸ The revolutionary Georgii Plekhanov conceded years after he left the Voronezh Military Gymnasium that the “teaching was intelligent and the [academic] program in the[se] education institutions improved considerably” as a result of the Miliutin reforms.³⁹

The cadet schools employed progressive pedagogical measures and structured the academic curriculum to increase in difficulty in accordance with the capabilities of children. The Main Administration of Military Educational Institutions, the Ministry of War’s governing body for all military educational institutions, and *Pedagogicheskii sbornik* encouraged teachers to use active teaching methods (*aktivnye metody*), such as the Socratic method or constant asking of questions (*vysprashchivaiushchii metod*) and visual or hands-on learning (*nagliadnoe obuchenie*), in order to keep classes interesting and develop individual initiative. Teachers at the cadet schools found it useful to conduct lessons outside the classroom by taking students on excursions to collect insects, identify plants, and observe birds.⁴⁰ For the first three years, all students learned according to the elementary (*elementarnyi*) pedagogical method characterized by one teacher per class. After their third year, cadets progressed to the systematic method (*sistemicheskii*), where they had lecture-type lessons and a different teacher for each subject.⁴¹

The Main Administration for Military Education Institutions made efforts to avoid overburdening the students with excessive homework. Directives prescribed no more than two

³⁸ I. D. Smirnov, “Iz starykh vospominanii,” *Sovremennik* (July 1912), 235-6.

³⁹ G. V. Plekhanov, *Literaturnoe nasledie*, ed. A. V. Lunacharskii, vol. I (Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe Sotsial’no-Ekonomicheskoe Izdatel’stvo, 1935), 93.

⁴⁰ Pavlov, “Vospominanie,” 40.

⁴¹ Alpatov, *Uchebno-vospitatel’naia rabota*, 113-4; Galushkov and Kolesnikov, *Shkola rossiiskogo ofitserstva*, 82.

and a half hours of homework per day and no homework on weekends.⁴² Examinations caused the students anxiety, and the Ministry of War took measures to reduce the pressure on students. In the lower classes, school officials evaluated the pupils by reviews (*kontrol'nye raboty*) but, for the upper classes, the final exams were serious affairs.⁴³ Older students could be expelled for failing an exam. An 1886 reform rejected mid-year exams in favor of evaluations conducted over a period of time. The anonymous author of the “Essay for the Reworking of a New Program for the Cadet Schools,” published in 1889, justified this change by arguing that mid-year exams did not adequately reflect what the students knew. This report recognized that examination periods excited the students so that they were “boiling” (*kipenie*), which “harmfully affects children’s health because it causes nervousness—an unfortunate phenomenon of the present times.”⁴⁴ The academic environment in the cadet schools was one of encouragement and reward. When a student excelled, news of his success was sent to his parents.⁴⁵

Teacher accounts from the cadet schools expressed less confidence in the new pedagogical methods. Von Bool’ recorded that the results of the first cohort to take its final examinations after the Miliutin reforms appalled him.⁴⁶ Iakubovich’s memoir indicates that teachers may have ignored the new pedagogical methods. He recalled lengthy discussions with his peers on pedagogical theories and articles, which were “diligently read by many but somehow influenced little in practice.”⁴⁷ An article from 1871 in *Pedagogicheskii sbornik*, entitled “On the Main Causes for the Unsatisfactory Results Attained by the Military Gymnasia in the Academic

⁴² Piskunov, *Ocherki istorii shkoly i pedagogicheskoi mysli narodov SSSR*, 142.

⁴³ Alpatov, “Voennye gimnazii v Rossii,” 33.

⁴⁴ “Ocherk razrabotki novykh program dlia kadetskikh korpusov,” *Pedagogicheskii sbornik* (December 1889), 555.

⁴⁵ Alpatov, “Voennye gimnazii v Rossii,” 33.

⁴⁶ Von Bool’, “Vospominanie,” *Russkaia starina* 120 (November 1904), 313

⁴⁷ Iakubovich, “Letopis’,” *Russkaia starina* 155 (August 1913), 341.

Course,” confirms Iakubovich’s criticism of the ineffectiveness of the new teaching methods.⁴⁸ Its author, pedagogue A. Batatsi, believed that the Ministry of War’s demand for word-by-word fulfillment of protocols from St. Petersburg hindered skilled pedagogues’ ability to choose which methods worked best and confused inexperienced teachers in the classroom.⁴⁹

Contemporary pedagogical literature and memoir writers decades later voiced these complaints, but the Minister of War remained a staunch supporter of the new pedagogical methods. Miliutin’s journal reveals that he felt it necessary to intervene in academic affairs during a visit to one of these institutions. He reminded teachers to develop “logical thought and systematic presentation” in Russian language classes and “the application of theories to find solutions” instead of the simple “memorization of theories and formulae” in mathematics classes.⁵⁰ The best innovation may have been more personal attention to each student. Each class of students had an outside advisor or tutor, *vospitatel’*, who supervised his upbringing in the institution. Even the skeptical pedagogue von Bool’ believed that the reforms in these institutions were necessary, because “the former cadet schools outlived their time and urgently demanded a renovation, in part academic affairs, but primarily in *vospitanie*.”⁵¹

In contrast to the few reports on academics from cadets and teachers at the military secondary schools, students from civilian schools frequently voiced their displeasure with their academic education. The classical gymnasium’s curriculum focused on the study of Latin and Greek to teach logic and condition the mind using rote memorization, while at the same time minimizing or avoiding altogether the more politically stimulating subjects such as Russian

⁴⁸ See A. I. Batatsi, “*O glavnykh prichinakh ne vpolne udovletvoritel’nykh rezul’tatov, dostigaemykh voennymi gimnaziiami po uchebnoi chasti*,” *Pedagogicheskii sbornik* (April 1871): 453-70; (May 1871): 604-29.

⁴⁹ Batatsi, “*O glavnykh prichinakh*,” *Pedagogicheskii sbornik* (April 1871), 461.

⁵⁰ Miliutin, *Dnevnik*, vol. II, ed. P. A. Zaionchkovskii (Moscow: Gosdarstvennaia ordena Lenina Biblioteka SSSR, 1949), 38.

⁵¹ Von Bool’, “*Vospominanie*,” *Russkaia starina* 120 (November 1904), 302.

literature, the natural sciences, and history.⁵² Memoir accounts reveal that former students despised classical languages, believing that they benefitted little from studying them.⁵³ Upon graduating, these pupils expressed joy that the Greek lessons had ended and yearned to pursue other subjects in the universities. When students mentioned progressive pedagogical measures or student-centered educational strategies, they emphasized that these methods were unusual. The Ministry of Education under Count Tolstoi favored regimentation over innovation, so regulations restricted what civilian secondary school teachers could do in the classroom. For example, the elementary method was applied only in the first-year, preparatory class. After the first year, pupils at the classical gymnasia faced nothing but dry lectures. Mind-numbing amounts of homework caused some students to despair and others to cheat. These authors demonstrated boredom and frustration with the academic element of their secondary school experiences and believed that this animosity harmed young people and Russian society in general.

Vladimir Shimkevich, a zoologist by profession who experienced the liberal system under Minister of Education Golovin and the formalism under Tolstoi, had nothing but enmity for the new regime after 1871. His memoir begins and ends with criticisms of the classical gymnasium. He claimed that Tolstoi's system of *vospitanie* was based on the ridiculous idea that "by loading up the youth with backbreaking work (*neposil'naia rabota*), they would distract them from thoughts that in their opinion should not interest the well-mannered youth."⁵⁴ Shimkevich reserved his harshest criticism for the end of his memoir, when he asked himself what happened to all those who failed out of the civilian gymnasia. Answering his own question, he wrote, "some go to the revolutionaries (*partii deistviia*), others succeed in scrambling out again and

⁵² Sinel, *The Classroom and the Chancellery*, 172.

⁵³ The historian James Muckle has examined student memoirs to evaluate the popularity of the classical system. Their authors agreed that students hated classical languages and saw no use for learning them. See James Muckle, "The Darlington Report and Beyond: Secondary Education in Russia and its Problems – some Eyewitnesses Relate their Experiences," in *Thomas Darlington's Report on Education in Russia*, ed. Janusz Tomiak (London: School of Slavonic and East European Studies, 1987), 34-43.

⁵⁴ Vladimir Shimkevich, "Iz gimnazicheskikh vospominanii," *Ruskaia shkola* (January 1906), 52.

find their way in practical activities, the third enter the military, and many die slowly, but surely.” The gymnasium, he believed, created a “Chekhovian” atmosphere in which intelligent people “suffocate as a result of their impotence against stupid platitudes.” The resulting product was a “half-intelligentsia” (*poluintelligentsia*), stunted from the schools and reduced in number because of “the obstacles and barriers to secondary education.” And for Russia, a “little-cultured country, which should value each working individual and separate quality” (*otdel’naia sila*), this system of education was “uncalculating, harmful, and murderous” (*ne raschetlivyi, vrednyi, i ubiistvennyi*).⁵⁵ The memoirist Poroshin, another exemplary student and future teacher, described Greek lessons as being “murderously boring” (*ubiistvenno-skuchno*), but he attributed the low quality of the lessons to his teacher’s inability to make it interesting for the pupils.⁵⁶

Shimkevich took pleasure in telling the gymnasium director that he planned to study in the physical mathematics department at St. Petersburg University. He proclaimed to the director that “you are a classicist,” and imagined adding that “you strangled us with classicism, but now I will be a naturalist and no strength in the world can force me to study your carrion.”⁵⁷ Poroshin remembered graduation as “the happiest day of our young lives.” The director tried to convince Poroshin to stay at the Nizhen Philological Institute, which trained teachers and was attached to the gymnasium from which he had graduated. Poroshin believed that, because of the weight the gymnasium placed on the classical languages, the last subjects any graduate wanted to study were ancient languages. Only three or four of Poroshin’s classmates entered the philological institute, and these were the ones with “no place to go.”⁵⁸ The rest of the graduating students, who Poroshin labeled the “traitors to classicism,” sought out the “broad and serious education” at the

⁵⁵ Idem., *Ruskaia shkola* (February 1906), 44.

⁵⁶ Poroshin, “*Chetvert’ veka nazad*,” *Ruskaia shkola* (April 1905), 20.

⁵⁷ Shimkevich, “*Iz gimnazicheskikh vospominanii*,” *Ruskaia shkola* (February 1906), 40.

⁵⁸ Poroshin, “*Chetvert’ veka nazad*,” *Ruskaia shkola* (April 1905), 25-27.

university. Even though Poroshin became a teacher years later, he still found it necessary to remind his readers that, upon graduation, no secondary school student values his knowledge of classical languages. The scientist Shimkevich felt much more confident in denouncing the teaching of classical languages. After all, he did not see how Greek and Latin assisted someone in his scientific line of work, and his professional knowledge enabled him to identify the harmful effects this lack of *vospitanie* was producing on society.

The contrast between the cadets, who appear to have approved tacitly of the academics in their institutions, and the civilian students, who complained about the uselessness of an academic curriculum based on classical languages, reveals that military cadets were more satisfied with their academic education than the civilian counterparts. These memoirs serve as a recommendation to the early twentieth-century Russian reading public, because they advocated on behalf of vocational education. As we shall see, for civilian secondary school students, the academic element of *vospitanie* came from outside the school.

Teachers and School Administrators

Teachers and school administrators are frequently the only adults who appear in the memoirs, and the writers characterized them as examples of the ideal colleague or grown-up, a talented but flawed human being, or a hopeless degenerate. Deborah Howard, in her Indiana University dissertation, correctly notes that former students frequently judged their teachers according to the long-term impact the teacher left on the students' lives or the teacher's adherence to a code of conduct approved by the students.⁵⁹ The ideal teacher fostered interest in a certain subject and convinced the students why this subject would help them later in life. Former cadets gave their teachers glowing reviews, while former civilian gymnasium students either praised or condemned their teachers. Teachers evaluated their peers in a similar fashion, but they seemed

⁵⁹ Howard, "Elite Secondary Education," 250.

more likely to pay attention to professional ethos, competency, and talent. The differences in the depictions of teachers from the cadet schools and civilian schools show that the memoirists and publishers who produced these works directed the reading public's attention to recent successes and failures in Russian education. By emphasizing the quality of the teachers in the cadet schools, writers advocated on behalf of the humane, student-centered *vospitanie* employed therein. And, by exposing the reading public to the sorry state of teachers in the civilian schools, graduates from these schools recommended changes in professional attitudes and educational policies intended to benefit students.

Former cadets emphasized that they had a strong bond with their teachers and upheld them as competent professionals. One former student recalled that as a result of the Miliutin reforms, "the faculty was overhauled; educated and cultured people appeared among us."⁶⁰ Classroom instructors, *vospitateli*, frequently dropped in on students in the dorms to chat with them.⁶¹ *Vospitateli* tried to foster in the students a love of intellectual labor outside class by reading to them, lending books, or inviting them into their apartments for discussions. Their responsibilities were to help the younger students with their homework, look over their assignments, and answer their questions.⁶² A former student recalled, "many years later, when I meet with my classmates, we reminisce about our former teachers, sharing our respect and gratitude [for them]."⁶³ The same student added that, following graduation, "many of us did not lose our connection with the teachers and made use of their advice and direction in difficult moments of life."⁶⁴

⁶⁰ L. Shishko, *Sergei Mikhailovich Kravchinskii i kruzhok Chaikovtsev* (St. Petersburg: Raspopoza, 1903), 1.

⁶¹ N. Z---ov, "Iz vospominanii," *Pedagogicheskii sbornik* (January 1907), 531; Galushko, *Shkola rossiiskogo ofitserstva*, 75.

⁶² Iakubovich, "Letopis'," *Ruskaia starina* 155 (July 1913), 128.

⁶³ N. Z---ov, "Iz vospominanii," *Pedagogicheskii sbornik* (January 1907), 64.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 66.

When former cadets singled out an individual teacher, they usually praised him as an ideal parental figure or pointed out his peculiar, quirky qualities. Since most cadets rarely left the institution, and some were military orphans, teachers were the only parental figures they had. The loss of a well-liked teacher devastated cadets, who equated it with the loss of a family member. The anonymous memoirist from the Kiev Military Gymnasium devoted more space in his memoir to the untimely death of the gymnasium's director, Pavel Iushenoy, than any other event.⁶⁵ Fortunately for this student, the new director was equally endearing. The students went to the new director for advice, "knowing that he would hear us out with full sympathy."⁶⁶

Civilian school memoirs contained positive depictions of teachers that provided role models for future Russian teachers and evinced the moral qualities that the memoirists sought to live up to as grown-ups. However, when civilian gymnasium students discussed their favorite teachers, they emphasized that these teachers were exceptional subjects, whose presence sometimes counteracted the desires of the administration. Shimkevich described his literature teacher, Ippolit Pavlov, as follows, "He instilled sympathy in us with his earnest and soft voice and his manners of a gentleman. He always called his students "my friend," and once giving a five would not change it to another grade; if a student answered poorly afterwards, he always received the same unchanging five."⁶⁷ The Ministry of Education, which implemented stern measures on evaluating students' work, would have considered Pavlov's grading system a violation of official policy, but the students did not complain because it was consistent and they benefitted from it.⁶⁸ Shimkevich's other favorite teacher was the class tutor, a humanist who, he

⁶⁵ Ibid., 60-62.

⁶⁶ Idem, "Iz vospominanii," *Pedagogicheskii sbornik* (June 1907), 531.

⁶⁷ The Russian grading system was based on a score of one to five, five being the best. Ones and twos were not passing marks and if a student earned a mark of one or two in any class, he had to repeat the entire year-long course in all subjects. Shimkevich, "Iz gimnazicheskikh vospominanii," *Ruskaia shkola* (January 1906), 45.

claimed, “appeared contrary to the school authorities’ formalist wishes and was a product of the unconquerable times.”⁶⁹ He wrote that “his kind soul shone in his bright blue eyes and his bearded Russian face; kindheartedness was reflected in his half clumsy movements and slow limping gait; kindheartedness was heard in his soft, even tempered, hoarse little voice.”⁷⁰ The young Leon Trotsky loved his German teacher, Struve. He recalled that “Struve was a most honest person; he suffered over the failures of his pupils, he sensed their agitation, encouraged them, and was grieved over every ‘two’.”⁷¹

The teachers in these descriptions cared deeply how students performed in their classes, and students yearned to meet their expectations. Students even recognized teachers who were unkind but impartial in evaluating schoolwork. Poroshin described one classical languages teacher thus: “Abramov was very strict, at times even harsh in spirit, but he remained just; he was unable to tolerate any ‘favoritism’ and enjoyed great respect from his students.”⁷² Poroshin’s favorite teacher, Belorussov, while a political conservative and Slavophile who did not sympathize with the progressive views of the students, still encouraged the students to engage in debates, write essays, and respect each others’ opinions.⁷³ These teachers earned the respect of students because they broke the rules or stood out from the crowd in their institution. By commemorating the good teachers in their memoirs from the 1860s through the 1880s, former students articulated an unofficial ideal that they expected of teachers in turn-of-the-century Russia. The problem for Russian education, civilian secondary school students believed, was that

⁶⁸ On regulations setting forth strict guidelines for teachers to grade their students, see Sinel, *The Classroom and the Chancellery*, 176.

⁶⁹ Shimkevich, “Iz gimnazicheskikh vospominanii,” *Russkaia shkola* (January 1906), 33.

⁷⁰ Idem., “Iz gimnazicheskikh vospominanii,” *Russkaia shkola* (January 1906), 32-33.

⁷¹ Leon Trotsky, *My Life: An Attempt at an Autobiography* (Mineola: Dover, 2007), 51.

⁷² Poroshin, “Chetvert’ veka nazad,” *Russkaia shkola* (April, 1905), 19.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, 20.

poor policies from the Ministry of Education and the many bad teachers employed by it constantly stymied the efforts of the few talented pedagogues.

Colorful descriptions of bad teachers are ubiquitous in the accounts by students from civilian gymnasia. Wicked characters spice up the story, and former students took revenge on the teachers that they disliked by publishing their misdeeds.⁷⁴ The memoir descriptions of bad teachers frequently underline how these pedagogues lacked moral fortitude, even-mindedness to judge between right and wrong, and the ability to support themselves financially in adult life. At Shimkevich's gymnasium, the students nicknamed one class tutor "Cholera," because "his long, bent, mangy figure with a pale, sick face and black, evil eyes, covered with large bruises – resembled cholera."⁷⁵ The students recalled that Cholera's behavior was deceitful. He snuck up, sniffed, and spied on students. Cholera served a purpose for the students too, but even it was dishonest. He tattled on the students' pranks and conveyed student gossip to the administration, but also would spill the beans about what he had overheard at the teachers' meetings.⁷⁶ Shimkevich's math teacher was "tattered, yellow, with large, sick-gaping eyes." The man was smart and a competent teacher, but the students did not like him because he was "ill-tempered and irritable."⁷⁷ Trotsky believed that "the percentage of freaks among people in general is very considerable but it is especially high among teachers."⁷⁸ His mathematics teacher, Zlotchansky, was described as follows:

Thin, with a prickly mustache on greenish-yellow face; his eyeballs were muddy, his movements as sluggish as if he had just awakened. He coughed noisily and spat in the

⁷⁴ Poroshin implied this when he mentions that at the Vologda Gymnasium, "harsh teachers were not there, otherwise my memoir would have preserved their names." See Poroshin, "Chetvert' veka nazad," *Russkaia shkola* (March 1905), 28.

⁷⁵ Shimkevich, "Iz gimnazicheskikh vospominanii," *Russkaia shkola* (January 1906), 43.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, 38.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 45

⁷⁸ Trotsky, *My Life*, 48.

classroom. It was known that he had an unhappy love affair, that he was dissipating and drinking. . . . Several years later he cut his throat with a razor.

M. Sukennikov, who graduated from the Second Odessa Gymnasium in the early 1890s, described his preparatory class teacher as far from ideal in the classroom and in life. “From our teachers,” he wrote, “we demand patience, evenness of character, justice, leadership, [and] fair relations to all pupils,” but Fedor Ivanovich “was evil, rude, and harsh” and “was not consistent in doling out punishments, these depended on his mood.”⁷⁹ The students imagined why Fedor Ivanovich was so inconsistent: “someone said that Fedor Ivanovich went on drinking sprees on Sundays and holidays, and therefore, on Mondays and after holidays he was morose and embittered, and we all believed this and told others.”⁸⁰ When Sukennikov entered the first-year group, the Second Odessa Gymnasium closed its preparatory class, and Fedor Ivanovich was let go. After this, one day, when Sukennikov was playing in the courtyard of his building, his old teacher approached him, reeking of liquor. Fedor Ivanovich’s face had aged, and his hair was so unkept that the young Sukennikov did not recognize him at first. He asked if Sukennikov’s father was home and was admitted to dinner with the family, where he consumed more wine and vodka. Fedor Ivanovich made a habit of stopping by Sukennikov’s house, never turning down dinner and vodka, and he began to use these opportunities to ask Sukennikov’s father for money. “Father gave him two paper rubles, and I listened as Fedor Ivanovich promised not to drink the money away and to fix his wardrobe,” but each time he reappeared, “he was always dirty and ragged.”⁸¹ Eventually he stopped coming, and Sukennikov never found out the fate of his former teacher. This writer devoted a great deal of space to presenting his former teacher as dissolute. Unemployed, drunk, dressed in rags, and dependent on the charity of others, Fedor Ivanovich was a long way from being in a position to serve as a role model for children. If a career in teaching

⁷⁹ Mikhail Sukennikov, “Gimnaziia vos’ midesiatykh godov,” *Russkaia shkola* (March 1904), 32-33.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 34.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 35-37.

ruined a person's health to the point of Cholera's or doomed an individual to failure in the world outside the institution, like Fedor Ivanovich, then the readers of these journals must certainly have felt an uneasiness about the effects that spending seven years in one of these institutions produced on Russia's youth.

For a more dispassionate evaluation of the teaching staff, we must turn to the memoirs by pedagogues and administrators. The memoirs of Iakubovich and von Bool' both described competent, humane teachers in the cadet schools, but they also identified and criticized poor instructors and practices more willingly than former cadets. When the teachers lacked talent, Iakubovich and von Bool' viewed the problems as resulting from an erroneous view of pedagogy, inexperience working with children, or incorrect bureaucratic policies.

Iakubovich's account reveals that he strived to become a good pedagogue. He readily admitted his own shortcomings in the beginning, but, by the end of his career, he believed that he had earned respect from his students and peers. At his first appointment in Moscow, he wrote,

My relations with the pupils were not as close and informal as I would have liked. I frequently compared them with other instructors, with whom [the children] joked, laughed, goofed off and flocked to when they entered the room. To me, [the children] were restrained. They turned to me with everyday, business-like questions. Evidently they respected, but did not love me. They conducted themselves cordially to me, and a few exchange letters with me.⁸²

His mentor was P. Nozovich, the director at his second posting in Nizhegorod. Nozovich believed that the ideal director should be a patriarchal figure. Iakubovich recorded that he

addressed all of the pupils with the informal "ty," patted them with his hand and scolded them with the most energetic words. This offended no one and all regarded his primitive repressive measures goodheartedly. His legacy has been preserved among his former pupils. Many did not break off their relations with him and made use of his intercession and advice all the way up until his death.⁸³

Again, since most pupils at the military secondary schools had either lost their parents or did not go home during holidays, the instructors were the closest thing to parents that many children had.

⁸² Iakubovich, "Letopis'," *Russkaia starina* 155 (August 1913), 345-6.

⁸³ *Ibid.*, 348.

In this environment, Iakubovich's memoir advocates on behalf of familial relations and mutual trust with the students.

The poor teachers in Iakubovich's account violated these precepts and refused to respect their pupils or understand that they were children. At his first post in Moscow, the harshest teachers were the seminarians, who maintained that the principal means of *vospitanie* was serious academic work and stern rules. They concluded that "the demanding school is more preferable because it develops fortitude and tact in struggling with life's misfortunes, and the sweet, outward humaneness of the times allegedly produces character weaknesses."⁸⁴ The fact that the seminarians held this view is not surprising because, as Laurie Manchester has shown by examining the memoirs of priests' sons, the seminary was a stringent institution.⁸⁵ At his second appointment in Nizhegorod, Iakubovich found that many of the university-trained instructors were the worst, because they treated children indifferently and harshly, and this behavior summoned protests from the pupils.⁸⁶

After the 1882 reform that reintroduced the military character in the Russian military secondary schools and required that all teaching be done by officers, a few officers from elite guards units were dispatched to Iakubovich's school. The director recalled that

They brought with them good social manners, but a few were completely unacquainted with the demands of modern pedagogy and paid all attention on the external order and manners of children, although they themselves did not always show restraint. The new teachers quickly acquired the methods of *vospitanie* but were not always mindful of the psyche of the children, and their authority was primarily founded on grading.⁸⁷

These teachers lacked experience and had to learn that the schoolhouse was different than the barracks, but teaching appears to have been a task that they could master. Iakubovich never

⁸⁴ Iakubovich, "Letopis'," *Ruskaia starina* 158 (June 1913), 610.

⁸⁵ See Laurie Manchester, *Holy Fathers, Secular Sons: Clergy, Intelligentsia, and the Modern Self in Revolutionary Russia* (DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 2008), 123-54.

⁸⁶ Iakubovich, "Letopis'," *Ruskaia starina* 155 (August 1913), 347-8.

⁸⁷ Idem, "Letopis'," *Ruskaia starina* 155 (July 1914), 114.

suggested that the cadet schools were full of the same talentless bores and moral degenerates that the civilian students castigated with such pleasure.

In contrast to Iakubovich, who saw teachers as either good or bad, von Bool' praised many of his peers for their intellectual talents but chided them for their character flaws as well. All of von Bool''s peers that made it into his memoir were intimately involved in St. Petersburg educated society, and some even belonged to the ranks of the radical intelligentsia. The very fact that these high-minded scholars taught in the First Military Gymnasium is impressive, but they all seemed to suffer from negative qualities that affected their work and caused them to quit the institution. Von Bool''s accusations against his peers are personal, not professional. Petty egos and character lapses, not a lack of talent, harmed the St. Petersburg military pedagogues. For example, Nikolai Lowman was a great teacher and an editor of the thick journal *The Sparks* (*Iskry*), but he was also a man ruined by ambition. Lowman never accepted the modest position of gymnasium teacher and eventually left the institution because he failed to secure a promotion. Vladimir Ostrogorskii was a talented novelist and playwright, a good teacher, and a friend of the great pedagogue Fedor Rezener, but he drank excessively on weekends and holidays. Vladimir Bauler, a talented composer, musician, and mathematics teacher, served as Ostrogorskii's drinking partner. Bauler's drinking caused him to be absent from lessons, lead a scandalous life, and teach poorly. The only reason why Bauler remained in the institution was that the director, General Evgenii Baumgarten, admired his music and ignored his iniquities.⁸⁸ When sober, this group should have been an accomplished faculty. However, the real struggle for von Bool' was with the administration and not the faculty.

Von Bool' reserved his harshest criticisms for the school administrators, who he believed reformed the cadet schools without proper forethought. Since von Bool' was a conservative and a supporter of many of the old cadet school traditions, it is not surprising that he faulted the reformers for destroying the good along with the bad. For von Bool', carelessness coupled with

⁸⁸ Von Bool', "Vospominanie," *Russkaia starina*, 120 (November 1904), 327-30.

ambition described the administration of the institutions of military education during the period of the Great Reforms. He believed that General Isakov, the director of the Main Administration of Military Education Institutions, implemented the reforms without a firmly entrenched plan for the cadets already studying in the institutions.⁸⁹ As a result of Isakov's hasty transformation, the Ministry of War closed schools and transferred students between them without any attention to the harmful effects that this confusion produced on the youth. Von Bool' described his first director, Baumgarten, as "a man of extremely limited talents, but considering himself unusually intelligent, he entered discussions about any kind of question."⁹⁰ The new pedagogical methods and directives confused Baumgarten. As a result of the student disturbances associated with the transformation from the cadet school to the military gymnasium, he reintroduced the rod, even though this was forbidden by decrees from above. Baumgarten and his deputy, the inspector of classes, N. Belokha, frequently sat in on classes and interrupted the teacher trying to give the lesson. Von Bool' concluded that administrative meddling harmed military education, and this undermined the positive aspects of the reforms in these institutions. He wrote,

The transformation of the corps began at the most favorable time, when a striving for activity awoke in Russian society, and pedagogues were very happy to apply their talents to modern *vospitanie*, which was located in the military schools. Educated and experienced people gladly became instructors. The director of the military gymnasium was able to employ these people, and the gymnasium was quickly furnished with wonderful teachers. But, as we witnessed, in Petersburg the transformation produced such poor results that in two or three years after the transformation, voices began to ring out: "is it worth hiring the good instructor if people who are wonderful pedagogues cannot hold on to their posts?" And [fewer people] desired to go [teach] in the military gymnasia. Instructors began to turn into bureaucrats, serving their hours. . . . The people surrounding children became more intelligent and educated (in general, of course) many were former officers, but the *vospitanie* itself made little progress from that in the past.

Von Bool's derision of the petty egos and inefficient bureaucracy was not an unusual critique for someone intimately involved in a tsarist government institution. The significance of his criticisms lay in the fact that he called out the supposedly enlightened bureaucrats for

⁸⁹ Idem, "Vospominanie," *Russkaia starina*, 120 (October 1904), 100.

⁹⁰ Idem, "Vospominanie," *Russkaia starina* 120 (November 1904), 300.

mishandling their duties and being vain and petty. However, it is important to remember that von Bool' refused to label the administrators as incompetent. He believed that the Great Reforms succeeded in improving these institutions, but he also suggested that, had the right people been in charge, the improvements in these institutions would have been greater.

The descriptions of teachers in memoir sources from institutions of civilian and military secondary education contained a mixed appraisal of the teachers. Even when the military secondary school teachers and administrators presented negative caricatures of their peers, they emphasized that these pedagogues lacked skill, held misguided notions, or suffered from minor character defects. The pessimist von Bool' fundamentally disagreed with Isakov and Baumgarten, but he did not label either a social deviant.

In contrast to the military secondary schools, the poor teachers in the memoirs from civilian gymnasias appear out of control and irredeemably dissolute. Daniel Beer has shown that Russian psychiatrists by 1905 had become much more willing to accuse the autocracy for stifling independent thought and initiative. They believed that this suffocating environment produced weaknesses that led to Russia's military defeat and made the 1905 Revolution necessary for the psychological revival of the nation.⁹¹ The memoirists from the civilian secondary schools articulated this same drama on the micro-level within the gymnasium. The Ministry of Education's policies on the hiring, provisioning for, and training of teachers left teachers' professional capabilities and health in a deplorable state. Intimacy with these degenerates surely harmed pupils. While not overtly advocating for revolution, the civilian gymnasium students viewed the replacement of the most forlorn of these teachers and the abolishment of the Ministry of Education's asphyxiating reliance on classical languages as the best solution for curing Russia's secondary schools.

⁹¹ Daniel Beer, *Renovating Russia*, 75-77.

Discipline

Since the correct *vospitanie* of youth absorbed educated society in late imperial Russia, it is surprising that memoir accounts give little consideration to the question of school discipline. Works on the cadet schools pay closer attention to discipline because many of their students lived at school and because the Miliutin reforms introduced a new punitive regime designed to eliminate the harsh environment of the pre-reform cadet schools and improve relations between cadets and teachers. Civilian students identified teachers they believed violated their standards of conduct in punishing pupils, but they rarely detailed the nature of the disciplinary regime in the classical gymnasium. Secondary works suggest that the Tolstoi regime was harsh, and students agreed that the formalism and workload were discouraging, but the accounts unfortunately contain few descriptions of rules, rule-breakers, and punishments.⁹²

The harsh disciplinary regime and the poor discipline of cadets acted as two of the principle reasons for why Miliutin reformed the cadet schools in 1863. Prior to these changes, cadet disorders (*besporiadki*) commonly occurred at these institutions, embarrassing school authorities who seemed unable to maintain order.⁹³ When Miliutin assembled a committee to devise new regulations for the cadet schools, he consulted some of the best pedagogues in Russia and Europe to devise more effective, humane methods for ensuring discipline at the reformed institutions.⁹⁴ Miliutin's reforms of the army abolished corporal punishment for officers, and the Ministry of War, in accordance with this reform, restructured discipline at the cadet schools to make use of persuasive means and not to employ active retribution, humiliation, or insult.⁹⁵ More

⁹² Sinel, *The Classroom and the Chancellery*, 179.

⁹³ For an account of the two-day long mutiny at the First Moscow Cadet School during the Christmas holiday of 1862-1863, see Mikhail Ivanovich Dragomirov, "Mikhail Ivanovich Dragomirov i voenno-uchebnye zavedeniia," *Russkaia starina* 136 (October 1908), 39-43. For a description of the fall in discipline among cadets at the First Cadet School in St. Petersburg, see Von Bool', "Vospominanie," *Russkaia starina* 119 (August 1904), 297-9.

⁹⁴ Galushko, *Shkola rossiiskogo ofitserstva*, 85.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, 97.

humane punishments included lowering a student's marks, ordering him to stand for a sustained period of time, reproof (*vygovor*), depriving him of food or leave privileges, sentencing him to the prison cell (*kartser*), or removing his epaulettes. Pedagogical directives required that disciplinary measures correspond to the age of the student.⁹⁶ The rod was used rarely and only for the youngest classes. The most recalcitrant students could be transferred to another school or expelled. Preventative measures, such as housing the younger students away from the older students and not placing older students in charge of supervising their younger schoolmates, stopped misbehavior before it started. Instructors (*vospitateli*) who lived with the students in the dormitories kept an unremitting watch over students day and night. The leading Soviet scholar on imperial Russian military education Nikolai Alpatov, believed that student behavior improved as a result of these innovations.⁹⁷

Memoir writers claimed that the new regulations benefitted discipline on the ground, but bureaucratic formalism also restricted school directors' leeway in responding to each infraction. Iakubovich discarded the directives from St. Petersburg because they were too complicated and did not correspond to specific circumstances surrounding each infraction.⁹⁸ The director described the case of a student who had committed an act of "hooliganism" and, according to the regulations, was supposed to be expelled. Then "the father of the pupil turned up, an old Sevastopol veteran, cried like a baby and begged everyone present to punish his son with the rod but not expel him from the institution."⁹⁹ The school's administration agreed to honor the old man's requests but feared that an opponent of corporal punishment would find out if they used the rod. Instead, they gave the student the title "disciplined" (*shtrafovannyi*) in the grade book.

⁹⁶ Ibid., 86.

⁹⁷ Alpatov, "Voennye gimnazii v Rossii," 30.

⁹⁸ Iakubovich, "Letopis'," *Russkaia starina* 154 (June 1913), 617-8.

⁹⁹ Ibid., 618.

Iakubovich claims that “this kind of system was appealing, and it seemed that other military gymnasia established the status of disciplined.”¹⁰⁰ Soon afterward, a circular appeared from the Main Administration that forbade the rank of “disciplined” because it was harmful to the student’s *vospitanie* (*predstavliaet meru kraine vrednuiu v vospitatel’nom smysle*).¹⁰¹ This anecdote also suggests that individuals outside St. Petersburg’s ruling circles yet aware of the progressive ideals of the Great Reform era took the initiative to enact minor reforms themselves, which stirred the government to put an end to such ventures. Reforms in any educational institution under Alexander II were to come only from above.

Regardless of the progressive disciplinary measures, troublemakers could be found at any cadet school. Witnesses claimed that cadets from the pre-reform regime behaved worse than their younger peers.¹⁰² These students were distinguished by their “age, haughty gait, [and] anemic success in the sciences.”¹⁰³ Progressive disciplinary measures made little headway in the struggle against smoking, for example. Iakubovich believed that student behavior stereotypically corresponded with social class at the Simbirsk Military Gymnasium, one of the institutions that admitted non-noble students. He claimed that the non-nobles were poorly prepared for the rigors of academic life and, since they lived at home with their parents, more easily went on drinking sprees and frequently quit the institution.¹⁰⁴ Children of officers frequently had coarse manners but were well disciplined and courageous. The children of nobles were better prepared academically but were spoiled and egoistic; their high-minded parents annoyed Iakubovich by asking that their children be allowed to bathe alone.¹⁰⁵ These passages demonstrate that, in spite

¹⁰⁰ Ibid. 618.

¹⁰¹ Ibid., 618-9.

¹⁰² Pavlov, “Vospominanie,” 37; Iakubovich, “Letopis’,” *Russkaia starina* 154 (June 1913), 619.

¹⁰³ Pavlov, “Vospominanie,” 37.

¹⁰⁴ Iakubovich, “Letopis’,” *Russkaia starina* 156 (October 1913), 173.

¹⁰⁵ Ibid., 174.

of progressive ideals and democratic admissions policies, the Ministry of War failed to overcome cultural stereotypes or remake cadets into entirely new subjects.

In the end, Iakubovich recommended that the military discipline at the cadet schools, so long as it was carefully implemented, benefitted students and teachers alike. He wrote, “I know pedagogues who believe that aspects of the military discipline used in the cadet schools depersonalize their pupils and stifle independent thought. They consider military discipline improper for schools and [believe] it has nothing in common with [civilian] school’s discipline (*shkol’naia distsiplina*).” He maintained that military discipline taught youth hygiene and correct manners, which lead to internal, moral steadiness. He continued,

Youth with restrained manners more quickly acquire mental composure. Consequently, concern for decorum and good manners serves as a means for mental *vospitanie*, and good habits generally serve as a powerful ally in the *vospitanie* of a person, leaving him more leisure time (*dosug*) and preserving his strength for conscientious activities. . . . Military discipline demands obedience and the fulfillment of duties, not only by fear, but by conscience. Respect for the individual’s and other’s opinions, care and attentive relations to the younger, resourcefulness, duty before self – all of this demands military discipline. Really, is this not valuable for any school or does it contradict the principles of [civilian] school’s discipline?¹⁰⁶

These statements clearly show that Iakubovich defended the disciplinary regime employed at the cadet schools and believed that it was at least on par with that of the civilian schools. He articulated that it was easier to deal with problem children in civilian schools because the administration could simply expel them. For the directors of cadet schools, expulsion was morally difficult, because some of their pupils were military orphans or their parents lacked the means to send them to another institution.

In contrast to the writers from the cadet schools, who went to great lengths to prove that their disciplinary regime was humane, students at the civilian gymnasia boasted of breaking the Ministry of Education’s rules and asserted their own standards of behavior independent from Minister Tolstoi’s interference. Since most students at the civilian gymnasium lived at home,

¹⁰⁶ Iakubovich, “Letopis’,” *Russkaia starina*, 159 (July 1914), 137-8.

discipline in school did not play as great a role in shaping the youth as at the cadet schools. Regulations forbade students from bringing outside reading materials to school and forming student organizations, but these were not always enforced. While the dropout and expulsion rates may have been high, many who departed school entered another school or found employment.¹⁰⁷ Students refused to admit that the disciplinary regime in the classical gymnasia played a role in providing them with the *vospitanie* necessary for becoming conscientious adults.

More interesting than stories of arbitrary punishment (*proizvol*) and domineering disciplinarians in the classroom are stories of civilian students asserting their own behavioral norms away from the schoolhouse. Students believed that disciplining themselves played a greater role in providing them with the correct *vospitanie*. Poroshin admitted to being a member of a secret reading circle (*kruzhok*) at the Nezhin Gymnasium, which maintained its own library and “mutual-aid fund” for procuring books. The young author believed that this society was “not a trivial matter, it seemed to the participants extremely serious and important, and it unarguably produced on us the most beneficial disciplinary (*vospitatel’nyi*) influence, one countering laziness and idleness.”¹⁰⁸ Mikhail Shebalin, too, was a member of a similar circle, and he admitted in his memoir that his accomplices in a clique made a mistake when they refused admission to girls. He wrote that they believed, “there could not have been female (*gimnazistki*) members of our circle since there was a group of members who held the opinion that ‘babes’ (*bab*) should not be admitted in light of their un-conspiratorial nature (*nikonspirativnosti*) and because of the danger that some members would ‘become enamored’ with them (*uvlekat’sia*) and begin to ‘court’ them (*ukhazhivat’*).” The real trouble began when Sintsova, a high-minded feminist, mentioned to Shebalin that she knew about the circle. The misogynists (*zhenonnavistniki*) in the circle were inflamed, and the students accosted Sintsova to find out

¹⁰⁷ Sinel, *The Classroom and the Chancellery*, 202.

¹⁰⁸ Poroshin, “Chetvert’ veka nazad,” *Russkaia shkola*, (March 1905), 38-39.

what she knew. Some members of the circle were too familiar with the girls and had let their tongues slip. Within the circle, “the cavaliers,’ that is, those who were acquainted with the female students, were subjected to a chat (*pogovorit’sa*) about these dangers, and in the end, everyone calmed down and the affair came to an end.”¹⁰⁹ The girls’ presence in the secret circle compromised the boys’ self-discipline and lured them away from the serious activity of reading radical literature and preparing their minds for the future. As an adult, Shebalin looked back on his behavior as silly, but at the time, he believed that any influence that might compromise the unwritten student code of discipline was unacceptable. Disciplining the self to abide by student rules of conduct and to navigate the expectations of school and parental authorities appears to have been a requirement for any pupil acquiring the correct *vospitanie* in late imperial Russia.

Sex and the Danger of Losing Control

Students and teachers alike believed that sexual activity among the youth, outside marriage, posed the greatest threat to the self-control they were espousing. When the memoirists made references to sexual activity that they encountered during their gymnasium years or after, they always directed their condemnation onto other individuals or generations. None of the pupils kissed and told; in fact, they found no reason to boast of their exploits. Flaunting their conquests or admitting their transgressions would have undermined the serious composure that they advocated.

When students described sexual activity, which the same-sex environment at all types of gymnasias by no means encouraged, they portrayed it as a shameful transgression or a tempting trap. When Poroshin transferred to the Nezhin gymnasium as an advanced student, he travelled from Vologda to Nezhin via Moscow, where he stopped for a day. The sights of the city

¹⁰⁹ Shebalin, *Kliuchi vospominanii*, ed. I. A. Teodorovich (Moscow: Vsesoiuzni obshchestva politikatorzhan i ssyl’no-poseselentsev, 1935), 78-79.

fascinated him, but he also felt compelled to mention in his memoir an encounter that might happen in a large urban area but was not in any guidebook:

A proprietor of a hotel, hoping that I would stay a while, urged me to remain in Moscow until morning and promised to show me a night of various amusements and to introduce me to a delightful young lady, who was his relative. I had already been warned of men of this sort at home before setting out, and therefore, without special effort, I resisted the alluring prospects, which this commissioner produced for me. At sixteen years old, I was a dreamer-romantic, who thought that the idea of intimacy with a woman for money was loathsome. The majority of my peers and comrades shared these views on the relations with women throughout [our] school years. Modern youth begin to “live” earlier, and we—the generation of the [18]80s—undoubtedly were “backward” in this regard. In society at that time, public opinions did not encourage youth to jolly well “begin” at a young age, since abstinence would undermine health. Compassionate mothers who turned into housemaids in love with their grown sons appeared in Rus’ a little later.¹¹⁰

Poroshin confided in his memoir that he was not duped by the pimp because of his family’s warnings about the vices of the city and his self-discipline that visiting a prostitute would violate. He differentiated his generation from the youth he saw growing up around him in Russia in the early twentieth century, who apparently engaged in sex without restraint. Poroshin did not find his views on sexual activity literally “backward”; instead, he placed the word in quotes to clue his reader into the fact that his views on the relationship between discipline and sexual activity had been labeled “backward” by others. He blamed imprudent voices in society that encouraged the younger generation to act without restraint and mothers for corrupting their sons. Poroshin declared to his audience that he and most of his generation were too steadfast to fall for sexual temptation; he suggested that the generation that followed his lacked this self-restraint.

Selivanov took the sex question a step further in his memoir by revealing the extent of the danger to youth and proposing solutions to the problem. He speculated that sexual debauchery “could be the most important concern in the *vospitanie* [of youth], which pedagogy, to its great shame, does not address.” He claimed that he met a Khar’kov woman whose son, a student in the fourth class, “practiced homosexual sex [pederasty] and even though he had been condemned [for

¹¹⁰ Poroshin, “Chetvert’ veka nazad,” *Russkaia shkola* (January 1905), 32.

this], his comrades expressed the notion that this behaviour ‘is nothing unusual’ and that ‘it’s about time it developed.’” He mentioned that he knew pupils who were syphilitics and suffered from gonorrhoea. A pupil in a train car suggested to Selivanov a cure for the disease: “you need only to transfer the sickness by all possible ways to the largest number of women to get rid of the poison.” Selivanov’s fear was that “debauchery” caused “shame and dulling of the common senses that leads to murder and suicide.” He cited the well-known affair of Olga Palem and Aleksandr Dovnar as proof of the pathological dangers of uncontrolled sex, in which, he claimed, Palem murdered Dovnar because he had infected her with a sexually transmitted disease.¹¹¹ Modernity was to blame because “modern life awakens sexual instincts in youth early, [it] develops passion early, and children in a crowd influence one another, and this influence is evinced in the unwished for development of unnatural vices.” When Selivanov was a student, “the passions did not burn as strongly,” and social life had a different color. Many of his contemporaries dove into marriages during their first year of university, which turned out unhappily and ended in separation, but they at least showed the self-control to seek sexual gratification within the bonds of matrimony. He believed the current generation of youth was far worse: “our knightly relations to women were replaced by contempt for her, our platonic enthusiasm—by derision.”¹¹²

Selivanov identified two sources of the problem. The first is a pathological explanation: dissolution spreads by the wanton exchange of ideas and bodily fluids. Unlike Poroshin, who viewed sex as a distraction, Selivanov mentioned the danger of venereal disease, a significantly more malignant threat to society. The second source of the problem is a cultural explanation, which exacerbates the pathological diagnosis. The introduction and spread of pornography and

¹¹¹ Olga Palem shot and killed her lover and fiancée, Aleksandr Dovnar, and then attempted suicide in a room in St. Petersburg’s Hotel Evropa in 1894. The crime made sensational news in St. Petersburg’s newspapers at the time.

¹¹² Selivanov, “Khar’kovskaia tret’ia gimnaziia: 25 let tomu nazad,” *Khar’kovskii sbornik* (October 1896), 150-2.

erotic literature in Russia around the turn of the century, the lack of surveillance of public places where children congregated, and the pedagogy employed within secondary institutions caused the passions to rise in young people.¹¹³ Selivanov's explanation is based on the psychological discourse of late imperial Russia that blamed the changes in the socioeconomic order that resulted from capitalism for the epidemiological spread of degenerative behavior. As Daniel Beer argues, this diagnosis resonated as a powerful critique of capitalism.¹¹⁴ Selivanov recommended prophylactic measures instead of overthrowing the capitalist order, possibly because he believed that revolution would engender a great deal more degenerative behavior. While modernity was to blame, Selivanov recommended greater surveillance, caring teachers, and improved pedagogy to teach youth to restrain their passions. His solution was in accordance with the pedagogical discourse on sexuality, which Laura Engelstein claims wished to discipline males to "inhabit the streets without succumbing to the lure of sensual gratification."¹¹⁵

Iakubovich also discussed sexual activity in cadet schools, but his description of the problem was different from Selivanov's because, as an older pedagogue, he believed that some degree of sexual activity was inherent in any closed educational institution, and, as a military officer, he claimed the problem could be controlled by proper leadership, attention to hygiene, pragmatic education, and strict discipline. The director was aware that "secret vices visibly existed in the institution, but it was secret and never passed into cynicism." He feared "sexual perversity and immature development of [children's] sexual instinct" and that restraining vice "became especially difficult [to control] after pornography was introduced to Russia." However, Iakubovich did not bemoan the loss of a generation of Russian youth like Selivanov, nor did he set his own experiences apart from the present generation to underline his own superiority as both

¹¹³ Ibid., 150-2.

¹¹⁴ Beer, *Renovating Russia*, 95, 135.

¹¹⁵ Laura Engelstein, *The Keys to Happiness: Sex and the Search for Modernity in Fin-de-Siecle Russia* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press: 1992), 217.

Poroshin and Selivanov did. For dealing with these vices, Iakubovich suggested three prescriptive methods drawn from his years of experience as a pedagogue. When he encountered two students openly masturbating, he quietly requested that the parents remove their sons from the institution. However, his preferred method was to discipline the youth through education. Teachers assigned scientific articles on reproduction to educate the students about sex, and the administration organized balls to encourage cadets to mingle with the correct type of girls and demonstrate good manners before women. The third solution, which Iakubovich only bore witness to and was shocked by, occurred when a director in Nizhnyi Novgorod gave a depressed youth money to visit a prostitute.¹¹⁶ Iakubovich appeared to have been more concerned with maintaining discipline within the institution than with curing the ills of Russia's youth like Selivanov. A long career teaching in these schools convinced the director that youth sexuality was endemic to any boarding school and could be controlled through proper education and moral *vospitanie*.

These three authors used their memoirs to articulate prophylactic solutions to the problem of sexual control in late imperial Russia. Poroshin's and Selivanov's arguments that dissolute sexual activity by youth was a pathological phenomenon resulting from the ills of modernity and the structures of Russian society mirror the medical discourse on degeneration in late imperial Russia that identified the problem as result of rapid changes as a result of modernization.¹¹⁷ Iakubovich's cure through education and discipline focused on the *vospitanie* of the male subjects themselves. All three authors saw youth as both the culprits and impressionable victims in need of moral *vospitanie* to resist the temptations of premature sex. Civilian students suggested that this fortitude could be learned independently, but this path presented dangers to the susceptible youth. Pedagogues from within the Ministry of Defense introduced sexual education into the classroom because they did not have the family to fall back on as a site of moral *vospitanie*.

¹¹⁶ Iakubovich, "Letopis'," *Russkaia starina* 155 (July 1914), 121-26.

¹¹⁷ Beer, *Renovating Russia*, 68-69.

Leisure Activities

Students from both the cadet and civilian schools upheld leisure activities as an essential part of *vospitanie*, which taught Russian youth the socialization skills they did not learn in the classroom. Cadets were much more likely than students of the civilian institutions to detail their leisure activities, because the Ministry of War prescribed these activities as necessary part of the *vospitanie* of future officers. Fearing subversive elements seeking to infect the youth with revolutionary propaganda, the Ministry of Education sought to limit the opportunities gymnasium students had to socialize with one another by forbidding student societies and clubs, banning outside books, and declaring public places such as taverns, clubs, and theaters off limits to pupils. These restrictions did not prevent students from socializing with one another or finding revolutionary propaganda on their own. When classical gymnasium students participated in these activities, they did so independently or under the guidance of an individual teacher, but always against the wishes of the Ministry of Education.

Memoir accounts indicate that extracurricular activities played a major role in determining whether a student enjoyed his years at school. Cadets praised their schools and made great efforts to describe the stimulating activities in which they partook outside the classroom. Civilian pupils emphasized the exceptionality or illegal nature of their pursuits outside the classroom. In the end, extracurricular activities helped to instill school pride in the cadets, and this loyalty survived war and revolution. The students from the civilian schools demonstrated no allegiance to their alma maters or the state authorities who managed them. When the autocracy teetered on the brink of disaster in 1905 and 1917, the impression garnered from the memoir accounts is that these pupils either rooted for its demise or were indifferent to its fate.

Cadets who had attended military secondary schools after the Miliutin reforms described their lives outside the classroom with great affection. Since many cadets stayed at school during vacations, the administration had to provide the students with entertaining, beneficial, extracurricular activities to contribute toward producing a well-rounded, critically thinking

person.¹¹⁸ The article “On the Extracurricular Activities of Pupils during Free Time” (*O neobiazatel’nykh zaniatiiakh vospitannikov v svobodnoe vremia*), published in *Pedagogicheskii sbornik* in 1868, reported on the wide range of leisure activities for students employed in the cadet schools. This article recommended dozens of activities for the goal of achieving physical and moral *vospitanie* and character development.¹¹⁹ Music was a popular activity, and every school had a choir and orchestra. Schools were outfitted with a workshop where students learned how to carve, saw, use a lathe, join, and inlay mosaics. Cadets were expected to participate in the upkeep of the school by repairing furniture and desks. During the summer months, students studied gardening and floriculture or went on excursions to factories, museums, theaters, sights of natural history, and sporting events. Cadets at the Kiev school relaxed at a summer camp, which “served as dachas for pupils remaining at the school over the vacation.”¹²⁰ The school authorities celebrated holidays at the cadet schools. During the winter, students went skating and sledding. Schools also participated in public welfare projects. For example, during the Balkan War of 1877-78, the director Iakubovich proudly recalled that his cadets sewed bandages and visited wounded soldiers.¹²¹ “In a word, almost everyone found an activity to his taste, and it is impossible to say that the time passed in boredom,” one former cadet recalled.¹²²

¹¹⁸ The wide range of extracurricular activities at military gymnasium institutions contrasted starkly with the limited prospects for independent pursuits at the pre-reform Nicholaevan cadet schools. This lack of stimulation may mean that many cadets were simply bored, and the outlet from this boredom may have manifested itself in cruelty to others and in the disorders (*besporiadki*) that became the immediate cause for the reform of the cadet schools during the 1862-1863 school year. See Dragomirov, “Mikhail Ivanovich Dragomirov,” 39-42; Boris Antonovich Shvanebakh, “Inzhener-General Boris Antonovich Shvanebakh: iz ego vospominanii i iz vospominanii o nem,” *Russkaia starina* 157 (January 1914), 159-160; Miller, 119-120; L. G. Beskrovnyi, *Russkaia armiiia i flot v XIX veke* (Moscow: Nauka, 1973), 252; Dmitrii Miliutin, *Vospominaniia, 1860-1862*, ed. L. G. Zakharova (Moscow: Rosspen, 1999), 258.

¹¹⁹ “O neobiazatel’nykh zaniatiiakh vospitannikov v svobodnoe vremia,” *Pedagogicheskii sbornik* (August 1868), 609-65.

¹²⁰ N. Z----ov, “Iz vospominanii,” *Pedagogicheskii sbornik* (June 1907), 527-8.

¹²¹ Iakubovich, “Letopis’,” *Russkaia starina* 156 (October 1913), 162.

¹²² N. Z----ov, “Iz vospominanii,” *Pedagogicheskii sbornik* (January 1907), 56.

Balls acted as another diversion that the school administration sponsored to teach young gentlemen proper comportment in society and to involve the local elites in the school.¹²³ Memoirists from military secondary schools describe balls in detail, while only one civilian secondary school memoir mentions dances being held at his school, and he may not have attended because the fêtes evidently were reserved for older students. One former director of a cadet school emphasized that balls “smoothed over awkwardness of manners” and “developed honest and restrained relations to the female sex.”¹²⁴ For the students, balls provided an opportunity to intermingle with the opposite sex. However, when given the chance to approach members of the fairer sex at balls, the cadets demonstrated no interest in girls. In his description of an 1893 ball to celebrate the fifty-year jubilee of the Orlov-Bakhtin Cadet School, A. Levitskii recalled that female students from the institutes and older classes of the women’s gymnasium attended the event. But none of the cadets made a move. The debutantes waited impatiently for approaching cavaliers, while the cadets emptied the buffet.¹²⁵ One memoirist from the Kiev Vladimir Military Gymnasium was more interested in how everyone was dressed than in finding out what lay underneath the clothes. At the same time, some desire for intimacy with members of the opposite sex must have been present in these institutions. Iakubovich twice had to settle brawls between his cadets and students from the civilian gymnasium over female students. It appears that cadet school authorities believed that the balls provided an opportunity to teach the cadets to conduct themselves according to the norms of acceptable behavior.

¹²³ Iakubovich, “Letopis’,” *Russkaia starina* 159 (July 1914), 121-122; Z---ov, “Iz vospominanii,” *Pedagogicheskii sbornik* (June 1907), 534-535; A. Levitskii, “Orlovskii Bakhtina kadetskii korpus” *Voennaia byl’* 95 (January 1969), 4-5; V. E. Milodanovich. “V Orlovskom-Bakhtina kadetskom korpuse: iz vospominanii Gen. Leit. E. A. Milodanovich.” *Voennaia byl’* 56 (July 1962): 44-45; Poroshin, “Chetvert’ veka nazad,” *Russkaia shkola* (March 1905), 28.

¹²⁴ Iakubovich, “Letopis’,” *Russkaia starina* 159 (July 1914), 121-2.

¹²⁵ Levitskii, “V Orlovskom-Bakhtina kadetskom korpuse,” 4.

The cadet schools used the balls and jubilees as public forums where the cadets demonstrated their deference to parental and state authorities and established a sense of continuity between the generations. The local elites exhibited their approval of the cadets, the institution, and the regime in general by participating in these ceremonies as well. Levitskii recalled that the local nobility and a few old alumni donated chandeliers to the school for the fête that he witnessed. For the celebration, the cadets eagerly decorated the school with patriotic colors and artworks and dressed mannequins in old cadet uniforms. Surviving photographs from some of these events show cadets themselves donning the old uniforms.¹²⁶ The anniversary celebration that Levitskii witnessed began with a religious ceremony, at which they honored the alumni who had died in battle.¹²⁷ The historical, religious, and patriotic décor at these events provided the cadets with a sense of dignity, which they earned by studying in institutions that boasted such proud histories. The school pride encouraged by such events explains why former cadets gathered in places as far away as San Francisco decades after they graduated and their former alma maters closed. In their memoirs, students educated in the civilian schools paid little notice to balls or similar school-sponsored events, and this silence helps to explain why these former students vented apathy and hatred for the institutions that raised them in their memoirs.

As discussed earlier, prior to the Great Reforms, the military regime at the cadet schools required that all pupils spend hours each day at drill and physical exercises. Sources from the pre-reform cadet schools complained that the demands in military training and conditioning were too burdensome for children.¹²⁸ The argument for the stern military regime at the cadet schools claimed that, by subjecting cadets to the difficulties of military life from an early age, they would

¹²⁶ See the photographs in Markov, *Kadety i iunkera*, 26, 81.

¹²⁷ Levitskii, "V Orlovskom-Bakhtina kadetskom korpuse," 4-5.

¹²⁸ Ashenbrenner, *Voennaia organizatsiia*, 2-4; Von Bool', "Vospominanie," *Russkaia starina*, 118 (May 1904), 379-82; idem., "Vospominanie," *Russkaia starina* 119 (August 1913), 297-98; Iakubovich, "Letopis'," *Russkaia starina* 154 (June, 1913), 609.

be better officers as adults.¹²⁹ Prior to the Crimean War, Russian military thinkers believed that hours of drill best prepared soldiers to perform infantry tactics designed for smoothbore muskets on the battlefield. In Russia's case, it was not until after defeat in the Crimea in 1856 and the Prussian victories in 1866 and 1871, when the Western powers' newer, rifled firearms demonstrated the obsolescence of smoothbore muskets and the eighteenth-century infantry tactics to use them, that military leaders began to lose confidence in linear tactics and the preoccupation with drill as preparation for battle.

With the battlefield importance of drill on the wane, Miliutin's challenge was to devise new exercises that contributed to developing the individual's confidence, will, strength, and adroitness. The Minister of War sent the physician Petr Lesgraft on several tours of Europe in the mid-1870s to observe physical exercises in foreign countries and devise a system of conditioning for the Russian cadet schools. Under Lesgraft's influence, the cadet schools introduced a gymnastics regime for children in accordance with the age and abilities of the cadet.¹³⁰ Cadets also participated in dancing lessons, fencing, gymnastics, swimming, and going on outings. None of these accounts complained about having to perform these exercises, most likely because their authors agreed that these activities were necessity for future military service and beneficial for the social endeavors of the imperial elite. It seems that Russian cadets recognized that physical exercises were essential for *vospitanie*, or they were having too much fun to realize that higher authorities were molding their bodies intentionally. After Miliutin's successor, Vannovskii, enhanced the martial character of cadet schools during the reign of Alexander III, drill and front

¹²⁹ Miller, *Dmitrii Miliutin and the Reform Era in Russia*, 102.

¹³⁰ Alpatov, *Uchebno-vospitatel'naia rabota*, 164.

exercises (*frontovye uprazhneniia*) returned as a required activity for all cadets, but the gymnastics and sports introduced under Miliutin also remained until the fall of the old regime.¹³¹

Miliutin's reforms also required civilian students to perform physical exercises to prepare their bodies for war. In response to the 1874 Universal Conscription Reform, the Ministry of Education introduced military gymnastics into the curriculum at civilian secondary schools for boys. Unlike the Ministry of War, the Ministry of Education did not emphasize individual athletic skills such as swimming or fencing. Instead, the Ministry of Education subjected pupils to rote calisthenics, similar to the monotonous memorization exercises employed in the Greek and Latin classes, in order to strengthen the body.

The classical gymnasium student Sukennikov complained that the introduction of physical exercises was burdensome for the students at his gymnasium. The school authorities apparently shortened the lesson and break times in the daily schedule to add an additional hour of gymnastics at the end of the day. These lessons were taught by a coarse, former officer who was unable to convince the students of the exercises' usefulness or produce examples that showed how to perform the exercises. Sukennikov wrote that "there were among us dashing and adroit fellows, gladly doing the gymnastics exercises," but "the majority of us were shy and clumsy." When the students failed to live up to the officer's stringent demands and stern disciplinary expectations, he swore at them. Some students began to cry; others received notes from their parents excusing them from the exercises because of their weak physiques. Interestingly, Sukennikov was unashamed to admit to his own weaknesses as a youth. When he wrote his memoirs twenty years later, he endorsed the opposite position, which held that "under good and capable authority, gymnastics (the goose step taught to us in the court yard, in fresh air) should

¹³¹ In Vannovskii's 1882 report to the tsar calling for reforms in the cadet schools, the new Minister of War recommended restricting drill and front activities to the two oldest classes "in order to avoid the mistakes which befell the [pre-reform] cadet school of exaggerating the meaning of military exercises to the detriment of class activities." See Zaionchkovskii, *Samoderzhavie*, 296.

have been able to invigorate the weak.”¹³² As Louise McReynolds has shown, Russian elites and city-dwellers began to embrace the European attitude that physical exercises and sports were integral to the modern healthy life around the turn of the twentieth century.¹³³ In Sukennikov’s case, years after he admitted his aversion to gymnastics and once athletics had been firmly implanted in Russian popular culture, the writer accepted the health benefits of physical conditioning.

Some gymnasium students, such as Anton Denikin, who would later serve as a general in the imperial and White armies, “loved gymnastics and thrived on the military regime,” but he was probably predisposed to gymnastics since he decided on a career in the army at a young age.¹³⁴ Aleksandr Grekhov also enjoyed the exercises despite his weak physique, and his description underlines the military nature of these activities: “We performed rhythmic movements, exercises of the arms, legs, the whole torso and even the back (too bad all of this was done wearing uniforms). We comprehended the purpose of the line, and youngsters superbly did difficult front exercises.”¹³⁵ However, once the gymnastics instructor whom Grekhov liked was replaced, the new instructor focused only on the goose step, and students lost their appetite for gymnastics. Grekhov concluded with the observation that “it’s a pity [about the changes], because this activity is useful and fun for children.”¹³⁶

These passages suggest that civilian gymnasium students did not always believe that improving one’s body was a necessary component of *vospitanie*. A weak adolescent physique

¹³² Sukennikov, “Gimnaziia vos’midesiatykh godov,” *Russkaia shkola* (September 1904), 67-67.

¹³³ For more on the sporting life in Russia, see Louise McReynolds, *Russia at Play: Leisure Activities at the End of the Tsarist Era* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2003), 76-112.

¹³⁴ Anton Denikin, *The Career of a Tsarist Officer: Memoirs, 1872-1916*, trans. Margaret Patoski (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1975), 32.

¹³⁵ Aleksandr Grekhov, “O Moem detstve dlia moikh detei,” in *Novocherkassk i platovskaia gimnaziia: v vospominaniakh i dokumentakh*, vol. 1, ed. V. A. Lopatin, (Moscow: Nauka, 1997), 84.

¹³⁶ *Ibid.*, 85.

was not something too shameful to be mentioned in a memoir. Cadets, on the other hand, saw physical exercises as necessary for proper *vospitanie*. By the time all of these adolescents grew up and wrote about their experiences in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, Russian leisure tastes had changed to promote the athletic life as the modern, healthy life, and the authors likewise prescribed physical exercises under the auspices of a qualified instructor as beneficial activities for youth.

Russian military and civilian secondary schools did not encourage their students to compete in organized sports, and their absence is a crucial philosophical difference between the Russian gymnasia and the British public schools, whose middle-class educational focus placed significant emphasis on developing a confident, independent character through athletics.¹³⁷ Sports are doggedly independent, and this helps to explain the absence of organized athletics in late imperial Russian education. Even in team sports, the team engages in the competition independent from its coach, who can only stand on the sideline and shout directions. When youth engage in sporting activities, they are set free from parental or teacher control to act on their own, albeit in a controlled environment. In Britain, sports served as the most important leisure activity for boys because they taught the youth to compete autonomously yet at the same time disciplined them to respect the other competitors.¹³⁸ The few Russian pedagogues who made the connection between athletics and self-improvement proved unable to introduce sports into the curriculum.¹³⁹

¹³⁷ Muckle, “The Darlington Report,” 35.

¹³⁸ Tony Money, *Manly and Muscular Diversions: Public Schools and the Nineteenth-Century Sporting Revival* (London: Duckworth, 1997), 66-69.

¹³⁹ In 1886, the famous Russian pedagogue Aleksandr Gerd published an article in *Pedagogicheskii sbornik* entitled “Games in English Schools and In Ours.” Team sports, argued Gerd, taught the participants “abstinence, restraint of fear, self-control, graciousness to the shortcomings of others, fairness, honor, camaraderie, patience, and insistence.” Gerd used medical evidence to show that Russian students needed a relief from their studies. He cited a higher number of suicides in Russia than in the West and rising rates of myopia, curvature of the spinal column, and inherited headaches that arise during learning, which, as a result, meant that “the present generation leaves a very pitiful legacy for the future.” Gerd acknowledged that the gymnastics and front exercises required in the cadet schools were useful, but he wished to add rowing, ball games, skating, ice bocce, and American baseball (*amerikanskaia lapta*) to the athletic regime. Competitions between the cadet schools “would inculcate the cadet with a wish to not disgrace his school

When Russia introduced physical education into civilian secondary schools following the Universal Conscription Reform of 1874, it was done to satisfy the regime's defense requirements and was not intended to benefit the students themselves by developing confidence, independence, and self-control. Only the Ministry of War deigned physical activity an educational as well as military function. No account mentioned competition in physical activities, and this absence indicates that the state-sponsored culture in Russian educational institutions around the turn of the century lagged behind popular tastes.

In a society where authoritarian control stifled the independent pursuit of knowledge in the schoolhouse, reading became one of the major outlets for a cultivated life outside the restrictions of the classroom. In the minds of some youth, the school was a powerful metaphor for the state, and reading helped students to subvert the pedagogical regime's efforts to mold them according to its own designs. Nearly all of the civilian secondary school memoirists went to great lengths to laud independent reading as the most important part of their gymnasium experience, which contributed greatly to improving their minds and providing them with the correct *vospitanie* during their years at school. Both the literature that the students read and the social aspect of reading and debating literature in groups taught students to think independently, to defend their own ideas to others, to respect their peers, and to channel their desires into serious, beneficial pursuits. The student who was not well read was not fully mature.

The cadet schools placed great importance on reading for the development of moral and intellectual capabilities. The "Instructions for the *Vospitanie* Plan for the Military Gymnasium" maintained that "outside of class reading by the pupils independently or with instructors has first priority after academic work."¹⁴⁰ Special provisions required that all reading materials come

and would force them to diligently prepare for events." The introduction of team sports would strengthen the individual male and serve as a prophylactic against the dissolution of society. See Aleksandr Gerd, "Igry v angliskikh shkolakh i u nas," *Pedagogicheskii sbornik* (May 1886), 525-31.

¹⁴⁰ See *Instruktsiia po vospitatel'noi chaste dlia voennykh gimnazii i progimnazii* (St. Petersburg: Glavnoe upravlenie voenno-uchebnykh zavedenii, 1881), 61. In 1886, this directive was reissued to all military

from the institution's library and correspond with the age of the student. Pedagogical literature from *Pedagogicheskii sbornik* strongly encouraged reading for children and prescribed measures to ensure that too much reading would not harm eyesight or health of the child.¹⁴¹ In the classroom, cadets were taught from a predetermined list of classic Russian literature that included Pushkin, Lermontov, and Gogol, and select foreign works such as the Iliad and Macbeth in translation.¹⁴² Very few former cadets felt compelled to list the authors who they read in school in their memoirs, an omission that contrasts starkly with the pupils from the civilian secondary schools who mentioned everything that they read. The two memoirists who mentioned authors' names listed Walter Scott, Thomas Mayne Reid, Gustave Aimard, and James Feinmore Cooper.¹⁴³ All popular novelists of the nineteenth century, the authors' tales of adventures in faraway corners of the world surely appealed to adolescent youth. However, judging from their memoirs, it appears that civilian secondary school students either read more or felt a stronger compulsion to detail their reading habits.

The civilian gymnasium's emphasis on the mechanical aspects of language study at the expense of literary criticism made reading literature outside class stimulating and rebellious. By stressing the seriousness of their search for literary knowledge, students denied the state authority in determining their academic success. A well-read person was an educated person, regardless if he possessed the *attestat*, the transcript documenting good grades and behavior, required for graduation or not. The Ministry of Education, therefore, unwittingly encouraged the very

secondary schools with the same instruction. See *Instruktsiia po vospitatel'noi chaste dlia kadetskikh korpusov* (St. Petersburg: Glavnoe upravlenie voenno-uchebnykh zavedenii, 1886), 38-9.

¹⁴¹ See Aleksandr Ostrogorskii, "O chtenie v otnoshenii gigieny zrenii," *Pedagogicheskii sbornik* (April 1883): 443-45.

¹⁴² For an argument by one pedagogue on why this list needed to be broadened, see A. Baratsi, "O glavnykh prichinakh ne vpolne udovletvoritel'nykh rezul'tatov, dostigaemykh voennymi gimnaziiami po uchebnoi chaste," *Pedagogicheskii sbornik* (May 1871), 609.

¹⁴³ P. Nechvolodov, "Voennaia gimnaziia," In *Sbornik vospominanii byvshikh pitomtsev Petrovskogo Poltavskogo kadetskogo korpusa* (Paris: Ob"edinenie, 1965), 16; Pavlov, "Vospominanie," 50.

feelings that Minister Tolstoi sought to prevent among the younger generation.¹⁴⁴ We cannot know for sure if the memoirists read every author that they listed. They rarely mentioned individual titles or explained how any specific novel or essay affected them. But the dropping of authors' names, particularly the great Russian novelists and radical social thinker, in the memoirs suggests that there was a certain body of authors that had to be read during one's youth in order for one to be considered an educated person.

Students frequently claimed to have read the authors who made up the canon of radical, nihilist Russian literature in the mid-nineteenth century. Of the thirteen student memoirs that describe reading outside school, eight name Dmitrii Pisarev, six Nikolai Dobroliubov, six Ivan Turgenev, five Nikolai Chernyshevskii, and four Ivan Goncharov, Alexander Herzen, Fyodor Dostoevsky, and Vissarion Belinskii. Students' interest in literature developed gradually, according to a similar pattern. In early adolescence, between the ages of twelve to fourteen, they began reading translated adventure novels, such as those written by Jules Verne or Thomas Mayne Reid. The pupils' literary tastes later evolved to include the great novelists, such as Tolstoi, Dostoevsky, and Gogol, and they finished their gymnasium years reading the most politically explosive authors such as Pisarev, Dobroliubov, and Chernyshevskii, who called for the replacement of Russia's autocracy with *Narodnism*, the nineteenth-century Russian brand of socialist utopianism.¹⁴⁵

Many of the students singled out teachers who first turned them on to reading at literary evenings for their students to read and debate what they were not covering in school.¹⁴⁶ One memoirist recalled that, "as a result of this kind of free teaching, we acquired an active interest in

¹⁴⁴ Sinel, *The Classroom and the Chancellery*, 213.

¹⁴⁵ Sukennikov, "Gimnaziia vos'midesiatykh godov," *Russkaia shkola* (May/June 1904), 35; Shimkevich, "Iz gimnazicheskikh vospominanii," *Russkaia shkola* (January 1906), 52; Shebalin, *Kliuchi vospominanii*, 68.

¹⁴⁶ Bekkarevich, "Orenburgskaia gimnaziia starogo vremeni," *Russkaia starina* (November 1903), 413-4; Poroshin, "Chetvert' veka nazad," *Russkaia shkola* (April 1905), 21; Selivanov, "Khar'kovskaia tret'ia gimnaziia," 147; E. V. Korsh, "Gimnazicheskie vospominaniia shestidesiatnika," *Russkii arkhiv* (March 1912), 451-2.

Russian literature, understood its meanings, tasks, and purposes, began to read consciously and search in contemporary literature for answers to the many questions arising in our young heads.”¹⁴⁷ The outside-of-class reading enabled teachers to provide the students with supplementary instruction on the critical thinking skills that they were not taught in the classroom. Shimkevich’s teacher L-v questioned him about his infatuation with Pisarev. L-v apparently found weaknesses in one of Pisarev’s arguments and this dismayed Shimkevich. But after reading the article a second time, the credulous Shimkevich came to the realization that Pisarev’s “brilliant prose makes contradictions in his thoughts and weaknesses of his arguments unnoticeable.”¹⁴⁸ These teachers also used the evenings as a venue for instructing their pupils in the proper norms of mature behavior. When Selivanov and his friends met with their teacher, Petr Zakharovich, outside class, he allowed them to have a shot of vodka or a beer. But under the elder’s guidance, drinking alcohol “never distracted from the honest interest in literature.”¹⁴⁹ Scenes such as these suggest that concerned teachers found it their obligation to instruct their students outside the classroom and to convert their pupils to the benefits of independent reading to improve themselves.

Poroshin’s memoir provides the best account for understanding the transformative effect that reading had on the students of Russia at this time. Born in 1864, Poroshin entered the Kazan’ Gymnasium in 1874. He made no mention of reading until his family moved from Kazan’ to Rybinsk in 1876, where he entered a progymnasium, a less-prestigious, four-year institution. In Rybinsk, since the school allotted little free time, he claimed the students read little and their level of development was low.¹⁵⁰ He reminded his readers that “if they did read, then they read without

¹⁴⁷ Korsh, “Gimnazicheskie vospominaniia shestidesiatnika,” 452.

¹⁴⁸ Shimkevich, “Iz gimnazicheskikh vospominanii,” *Russkaia shkola* (February 1906), 41.

¹⁴⁹ Selivanov, “Khar’kovskaia tret’ia gimnaziia,” 147.

¹⁵⁰ Poroshin, “Chetvert’ veka nazad,” *Russkaia shkola* (January 1905), 41.

any sense or direction,” and “the majority read nothing but textbooks and were interested in nothing.” The school was to blame for this shortcoming, because it only cared about external order and placed no gravity on the moral side of the students’ development.¹⁵¹ Upon completing the Rybinsk Progymnasium, Poroshin applied to the Nezhin Gymnasium in 1880, because it offered state stipends, but his application was rejected, and he entered the Vologda Classical Gymnasium instead.

In Vologda, Poroshin began meeting with small groups of friends to dabble in the great prose authors Turgenev, Tolstoi, and Dostoevsky and the literary criticism journals *Otechestvennye zapiski* (Fatherland Notes), *Delo* (Affair), and *Znanie* (Knowledge). The group members sometimes debated texts, but the discussions did not go as far as addressing deeper philosophical and social questions. None of the students at the Vologda Classical Gymnasium were exceptionally well read, because their reading “did not carry a defined systematic character,” but Poroshin admired the yearning for knowledge that reading produced among these students.¹⁵²

A year later, Poroshin entered the classical gymnasium in Nezhin, one of the most prestigious in the Russian empire, where he would complete his final year of secondary school. The erudition among the students at the Nezhin Gymnasium awed Poroshin, and he at first felt embarrassed by his own lack of knowledge. He wrote, “reaching this point in the gymnasium course as one of the best students and receiving medals and distinctions for success, I was accustomed to considering myself to be a better student than I deserved, and only here, in Nezhin, did I first understand that it was possible for a wonderful student, who received many fives in school, to remain at the same time a little-developed youth (*malo-razityi iunosha*).” Success on paper meant little; it was success in the eyes of his peers that affirmed Poroshin’s self-worth. His

¹⁵¹ Ibid., 41-42.

¹⁵² Idem, “Chetvert’ veka nazad,” *Russkaia shkola* (March 1905), 29.

new friends were familiar with foreign political and linguistic thinkers such as John Stuart Mill, Herbert Spencer, Joseph Ernest Renan, Jacob Moleschott, and David Strauss, and the great spokesmen of the Russian radical intelligentsia such as Dobroliubov, Chernyshevskii, Pisarev, and Herzen.¹⁵³ To overcome the disadvantages that life had dealt him, he read furiously everything that he could get his hands on to catch up to his Nezhin comrades and by the end had reached a level that he was not afraid to say equaled their abilities. His comrades also helped him along the way by providing provided him access to their secret library and inviting him to help with its upkeep. For Poroshin, “all of this had the most wholesome influence on the spiritual development (*dukhovnoe razvitiie*) of the pupils of the gymnasium and awoke in us a serious interest in Russian (*otechestvennaia*) literature and history, and this should be one of the present tasks of secondary education’s teaching of these subjects.”¹⁵⁴ Poroshin’s tireless efforts invigorated him, and he believed that he was able to manage the difficult moments of life according to his own strengths because of his experiences in Nezhin. Literature gave him purpose and taught him to shun idleness.¹⁵⁵

In the last part of Poroshin’s account, which takes place in the wake of the assassination of Alexander II, the school authorities unearthed the hidden library, canceled the student subscriptions to newspapers and journals, forbade student meetings, and confiscated the students’ mutual-aid fund for book acquisitions. These setbacks did not harm Poroshin himself. Books that have been read cannot be unread, and Poroshin had earned the *attestat*, which allowed him to enter a university. Poroshin’s concern was that future generations would be unable to fully develop in the same way that his cohort did in the Nezhin Gymnasium. He specifically drew attention to the library’s and mutual-aid fund’s past roles, “which [were] required for the development of so many” and “which performed such good service for us.” He even at one point

¹⁵³ Ibid., 37.

¹⁵⁴ Idem, “Chetvert’ veka nazad,” *Russkaia shkola* (April 1905), 21.

¹⁵⁵ Poroshin grew up to be a teacher and writer.

compared his own development before entering the Nezhin Gymnasium to a contemporary twentieth-century student, maintaining that, for the contemporary youth, “this much erudition would be more than enough,” but that twenty-five years ago the students in Nezhin were much better developed.¹⁵⁶ Poroshin believed the generation that followed his own lacked the moral fortitude that came as result of personal improvement. He, however, should have rested easily. Students read exactly as he did after the crackdown on secret libraries. During the 1880s Sukennikov read Dobroliubov and Pisarev, and D. Andreev read the whole canon of radical literature in a secret circle with the young Lenin.¹⁵⁷

For Russian youths, especially in civilian secondary schools, reading a specific body of literature not prescribed by the gymnasium curriculum was necessary for becoming an educated person and a beneficial activity for attuning young people’s minds to the important social and political tasks of the times. Civilian students believed that the stifling school atmosphere did not provide them with the necessary *vospitanie* to engage the world in which they lived, so they looked outside the classroom to acquire the knowledge forbidden by the Ministry of Education. The memoirist A. Grekhov regretted that he had not read the right works in secondary school. He admitted that he read mostly imported popular novels, “translated junk,” which spawned his fantasies but did not compel him “to try to understand why things were the way that they were and what needed to be done in order to change them.” Grekhov blamed the lack of guidance he received at the gymnasium and his illiterate mother’s lack of encouragement for his inability to become a properly trained young man. He warned his audience, “Book[s] should teach you the purpose of life and not alienate or isolate from it, as [they] did with me.”¹⁵⁸ Reading, Grekhov

¹⁵⁶ Poroshin, “Chetvert’ veka nazad,” *Russkaia shkola* (March 1905), 37.

¹⁵⁷ Sukennikov, “Gimnaziia vos’ midesiatykh godov,” *Russkaia shkola* (May/June 1904), 35; D. M. Andreev, “V gimnazicheskie gody,” *Zvezda* (June 1941), 9.

¹⁵⁸ Grekhov, “O Moem detstve,” 119-122.

and the other graduates of civilian gymnasia believed, was necessary for training the individual to confront the challenges that adult life had in store.

This section has attempted to show that Russian secondary school students believed that what they learned outside the classroom was as important as what they learned within it. Cadet schools provided their students with leisure activities that would keep them excited during their years at school and direct their youthful energy to profitable pursuits. The Ministry of Education failed to understand the benefits of extracurricular activities or incorporate these activities into the pedagogical program, and this difference between the types of educational institutions helps explain why none of the civilian school memoirists expressed school pride or loyalty to their alma mater. When civilian secondary school students sought out extracurricular activities to supplement the education they received in the classroom, they did so under the guidance of rogue teachers or secretly in the self-education circle. The cadet schools, in contrast, implanted in their students a corporate identity that survived war, revolution, and emigration.

Conclusion

This essay has shown that the Ministries of Education and War employed different strategies toward indoctrinating and training their students during the reigns of Alexander II and Alexander III. Since many of the cadets boarded at school, the Ministry of War paid great attention to giving its students the correct *vospitanie* to ensure that future officers were politically loyal to the autocracy, empire, and army. Following the Miliutin reforms in 1863, which introduced progressive and modern pedagogical innovations into the cadet schools, these institutions attempted to provide their students with an ideal adolescent experience. Reformers accomplished this goal by employing an academic course grounded in the sciences and modern languages, encouraging familial relations between teachers and students, utilizing progressive disciplinary measures intended to instruct, and giving the cadets numerous opportunities to pursue their interests outside of the classroom with extracurricular activities. The result of these

measures was positive; cadets enjoyed their time at school and celebrated their alma maters years after graduating. Furthermore, military secondary education was popular in the Russian empire because the number of cadet schools and the number of pupils studying in them increased nearly every year before the outbreak of the First World War.¹⁵⁹

In reforming the cadet schools, Miliutin sought to improve the education of officers, but it is unfair to judge the effectiveness of this reform if Russian military performance during the last half century of the old regime is used as the benchmark. The changes to the cadet schools, the systemization of military education, and the educational requirements for entry into the officer corps undoubtedly led to improvements from the military leadership of Nicholas I. However, following the Miliutin reforms, Russia enjoyed victory only in the 1877-78 war with Turkey. The forces of the old regime suffered catastrophic defeats in the Russo-Japanese War, the First World War, and the Russian Civil War. In addition, scholar John Bushnell claims that the Russian army's poor performance during the 1877-78 war with Turkey demonstrates that the Miliutin reforms produced no immediate effect on the fighting capacity of Russian forces.¹⁶⁰ Military historian Bruce Menning argues that in spite of improvements in weapons and logistics, Russian military planners learned the wrong lessons from the combat experiences in the Balkans in 1877-78 and the Far East in 1904-05 and continuously relied on outdated tactics and strategies.¹⁶¹ Examining conditions in the ranks during peacetime, Bushnell found that the late-Imperial Army depended on a premodern command and supply framework, veiled by the façade of modernity. For officers and enlisted men, abysmal provisions and salaries and the force of habit precluded

¹⁵⁹ Historian Mikhailov cites an increase from 4,432 cadets in all Russian cadet schools in 1869 to 12,883 cadets in 1914. See the tables in Mikhailov, *Rukovodstvo*, 441, 444-5. In addition, the number of cadet school institutions increased from fourteen when Alexander II acceded to the throne in 1855 to thirty-two by 1914. See Markov, *Kadety i iunkera*, 298.

¹⁶⁰ John Bushnell, "Miliutin and the Balkan War: Military Reform vs. Military Performance," in *Russia's Great Reforms, 1855-1881*, eds. Ben Eklof, John Bushnell and Larissa Zakharova (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1994): 139-58.

¹⁶¹ Bruce Menning, *Bayonets before Bullets: The Imperial Russian Army, 1861-1914* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1992).

institutional and cultural reform within the military.¹⁶² It seems that when cadets graduated from school, they left the idyllic world of youth for the comfortless life of service in the ranks. However, even if the officer corps grumbled about working conditions and the autocracy's interference in military affairs, the army remained firmly under civilian control up to 1917.

In contrast, students from the Ministry of Education's gymnasia frequently lamented that their years at school were burdensome and frustrating. These pupils left school feeling disillusioned with the state's attempts to circumscribe *vospitanie* and relieved that they could pursue their own wishes in adulthood. When these students attempted to supplement the curriculum taught in the schoolhouse with stimulating political and literary topics, they ran the risk of incurring punishment from state authorities. By failing to indoctrinate the students at civilian gymnasia with political awareness or gratitude for the education that the state provided them, the Ministry of Education ensured that its graduates possessed few ideological weapons to counter subversive influences from the revolutionary movement. The Ministry of Education and forces within civil society became aware of the neglect of *vospitanie* in the civilian secondary schools as a result of military defeat in Manchuria in 1905 and the behavior of young people during the Revolution of 1905. After 1905, school authorities increased the military training and physical education in civilian schools, and progressive social thinkers introduced the scouting movement to Russia.¹⁶³ However, in spite of these attempts to improvement *vospitanie*, Russia's experience during the First World War and Revolutions of 1917 indicates that the autocracy still failed to impress on graduates loyalty to the political powers that held sway over them and denied

¹⁶² John Bushnell, "Peasants in Uniform: The Tsarist Army as a Peasant Society," *The Journal of Social History* 13, no. 4 (summer 1980), 565-76; idem, "The Tsarist Officer Corps, 1881-1914: Customs, Duties, Inefficiency," *The American Historical Review* 86, no. 4 (October 1981), 753-80.

¹⁶³ See Donald P. Wright, "The Cultivation of Patriotism and the Militarization of Citizenship in Late Imperial Russia, 1906-1914" (Ph.D. diss., Tulane University, 2001); David R. Jones, "Forerunners of the Komsomol: Scouting in Imperial Russia," in *Reforming the Tsar's Army: Military Innovation in Imperial Russia from Peter the Great to the Revolution*, ed. David Shimmelpenninck van der Oye and Bruce W. Menning (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004): 56-81.

young people any agency in prompting reasonable political reforms or participating in the governing of Russia.

Russian secondary schools resembled two different modern European educational models identified by John Gillis, but Russia imitated neither paradigm exactly. The cadet school shared many features with the British public school such as the notion of preserving adolescence, the familial relations between teachers and cadets, and the emphasis on school-sponsored extracurricular activities. But the British school differed from the Russian cadet school in that it was an invention of the bourgeoisie, while the cadet school always remained a predominantly noble institution.¹⁶⁴ The Russian classical gymnasium more closely resembled its continental counterpart than the cadet school, but even it differed in the great concern that the Ministry of Education placed on the social origins of the pupils and their political activities. The striving to devour the great works of radical literature and the students' identification with the intelligentsia appears to be a most Russian phenomenon. In all, the structural similarities and cultural differences between the European and Russian institutions of secondary education indicate that imperial Russia shared in the greater, European historical trends, in this case, the expansion and systemization of secondary education, but this progression took on an emphatically Russian flavor in the East. The Russian Ministry of War took great pains to create an environment ideal for raising children who would engage the modern world. The Ministry of Education feared the pernicious influences of modernity on its students and sought to protect the political authorities by limiting its young subjects' exposure to the intellectual and cultural environment that surrounded them. Ultimately, the Ministry of Education's cautionary strategy failed to create an educated public committed to self-excellence, improvement of society, and maintenance of the autocracy.

¹⁶⁴ Mikhailov, *Rukovodstvo*, 249.

Works Cited

Primary Accounts by Former Cadets

- Ashenbrenner, M. Iu. *Voennaia organizatsiia narodnoi voli i drugie vospominaniia*. Edited by S. Tiutcheva. Moscow, 1924.
- Boguslavskii, V. "75 Let so dnia moego postupleniia v mikhailovskuiu voennuiu gimnaziuu." *Voennaia byl'* 24 (1957): 25-6.
- Denikin, Anton. *The Career of a Tsarist Officer: Memoirs, 1872-1916*. Translated by Margaret Patoski. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1975.
- Dragomirov, Mikhail Ivanovich. "Mikhail Ivanovich Dragomirov i voenno-uchebnye zavedeniia." *Russkaia starina* 136 (October 1908): 33-54.
- Milodanovich, V. E. "V Orlovskom-Bakhtina kadetskom korpuse: iz vospominanii Gen. Leit. E. A. Milodanovich." *Voennaia byl'* 56 (July 1962): 41-5.
- Kropotkin, Peter. *Memoirs of a Revolutionist*. Edited by Nicholas Walter. New York: Dover, 1988.
- Levitskii, A. "Orlovskii Bakhtina kadetskii korpus." *Voennaia byl'* 95 (January 1969): 1-5.
- Otfinovskii, K. K. "Moe prebyvanie v katedskom korpuse i voennom uchilishche." *Voennaia byl'* 89; (January 1968): 25-30.
- Pavlov, I. V. "Vospominanie o Sibirskoi Voennoi Gimnazii, 1870-1876." *Voennyi Mir* (June-July 1913): 32-59.
- Rediger, Aleksandr. *Istoriia moei zhizni: vospominaniia voennogo ministra*, vol. I. Edited by G. N. Kondrashev and G. E. Kuchkov. Moscow: Kanon, 1999.
- Nechvolodov, P. "Voennaia gimnaziia." In *Sbornik vospominanii byvshikh pitomtsev Petrovskogo Poltavskogo kadetskogo korpusa*, 14-16. Paris: Ob"edinenie, 1965.
- Shisko, L. *Sergei Mikhailovich Kravchinskii i kruzhek Chaikovtsev*. St. Petersburg: V. Raspopoz, 1903.
- Z---ov, N. "Iz vospominanii o Vladimirskaia Kievskoi Voennoi Gimnazii." Pts. 1 and 2. *Pedagogicheskii Sbornik* (January 1907): 56-71; (June 1907): 523-38.

Primary Accounts by Former Civilian Gymnasium Students

- Andreev, D. M. "V gimnazicheskie gody." *Zvezda* (June 1941): 3-15.
- Grekhov, Aleksandr. "O Moem detstve dlia moikh detei." *Novocherkassk i platonovskaia gimnaziia: v vospominaniakh i dokumentakh*, edited by V. A. Lopatin, vol. I, 14-133. Moscow: Nauka, 1997.

- Korsh, E. V. "Gimnazicheskaia vospominaniia, shestidesiatnika." *Russkii arkhiv* (March 1912): 437-64.
- Poroshin, Ivan Andreevich. "Chetvert' veka nazad." Pts. 1-3. *Russkaia shkola* (January 1905): 19-48; (March 1905): 27-39; (April 1905): 18-27.
- Selivanov, T. N. "Khar'kovskaia tret'ia gimnaziia: 25 let tomu nazad." *Khar'kovskii sbornik* (October 1896): 119-53.
- Shebalin, M. P. *Kliuchi vospominanii*. Edited by I. A. Teodorovich. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo vsesoiuznogo obshchestva politikatorzhan i ssyl'no-poselentsev, 1935.
- Shelgynov, N. V. *Vospominaniia*, vol. I. Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1967.
- Shimkevich, Vladimir Mikhailovich. "Iz gimnazicheskikh vospominanii." Pts.1 and 2. *Russkaia shkola* (January 1906): 38-53; (February 1906): 31-44.
- Sukennikov, M. "Gimnaziia vos'midesiatykh godov." Pts.1-4. *Russkaia shkola* (March 1904): 29-48; (May/June, 1904): 27-50; (July/ August 1904): 74-94; (September 1904): 61-71.
- Trotsky, Leon. *My Life: An Attempt at an Autobiography*. Mineola: Dover, 2007.

Primary Accounts by Former Teachers, Administrators, Ministers

- Iakubovich, N. A. "Letopis' i mysli starogo pedagoga." Pts. 1-6. *Russkaia starina* 154 (June 1913): 607-23; 155 (July 1913): 124-39; 155 (August 1913): 341-52; 156 (October 1913): 161-80; 158 (June 1914): 615-22; 159 (July 1914): 110-80.
- Miliutin, Dmitrii. D. A. *Dnevnik*. Edited by P. A. Zaionchkovskii. Moscow: Gosdarstvennaia ordena Lenina Biblioteka SSSR, vol. I, 1947; vol. II, 1949; vols. III-IV, 1950
- , *Vospominaniia*, 1865-1867. Edited by L. G. Zakharova. Moscow: Rosspen, 2005.
- , *Vospominaniia*, 1860-1862. Edited by L. G. Zakharova. Moscow: Rosspen, 1999.
- , *Vospominaniia*, 1863-1864. Edited by L. G. Zaharova. Moscow; Rosspen, 2003.
- , "Zapiska general-ad'iutanta gr. D. A. Miliutina po voprosu o preobrazovanii voenno-uchebnykh zavedenii." in *Stoletie voennogo ministerstva 1802-1902*, edited by D. A. Skalon (St. Petersburg, 1902), X, part II, 188-195.
- Pavolvskii, N. F. "Aleksandr Vasil'evich Golovin, ego uchastie v preobrazovanii voenno-uchebnykh zavedenii" *Russkaia starina* 55 (September 1887):663-6.
- Shvanebakh, Boris Antonovich. "Inzhener-General Boris Antonovich Shvanebakh: iz

ego vospominanii i iz vospominanii o nem.” *Russkaia starina* 157 (January 1914): 158-70.

Smirnov, I. D. “Iz starykh vospominanii.” *Sovremennik* (July 1912): 234-69.

Von Bool', Vladimir Georgievich. “Vospominanie pedagoga.” Pts. 1-8. *Russkaia starina* 117 (March 1904): 615-30; 118 (April 1904): 111-23; 118 (May 1904): 379-92; 119 (July 1904): 213-27; 119 (August 1904): 287-305; 119 (September 1904): 578-93; 120 (October 1904): 74-101; 120 (November 1904): 300-48.

Primary Pedagogical Literature

Batatsi, A. I. “O glavnykh prichinakh ne vpolne udovletvoritel'nykh rezul'tatov, dostigaemykh voennymi gimnaziiami po uchebnoi chaste.” Pts.1 and 2. *Pedagogicheskii sbornik* (April 1871): 453-70; (May 1871): 604-29.

Darlington, Thomas. *Education in Russia*. London: Wyman, 1909.

Gerd, Aleksandr. “Igry v angliiskikh shkolakh i u nas.” *Pedagogicheskii sbornik* (May 1886): 521-531.

Instruktsiia po vospitatel'no chaste dlia kadetskikh korpusov. St. Petersburg: Glavnoe upravlenie voenno-uchebnykh zavedenii, 1886.

L. K. “Vzgliad na stepen' obrazovaniia russkikh ofitserov v armii.” *Voennyi sbornik* (January 1858): 145-62.

Lalaev, M. *Istoricheskii ocherk voenno-uchebnykh zavedenii*. St. Petersburg, 1880.

“Ocherk razrabotki novykh program dlia kadetskikh korpusov.” *Pedagogicheskii sbornik* (December 1889): 552-79.

Ostrogorskii, Aleksandr. “O chtenie v otnoshenii gigieny zrenii.” *Pedagogicheskii sbornik* (April 1883): 443-5.

-----, A. N. *Ostrogorskii: Izbrannye pedagogicheskie sochineniia*. Edited by M. I. Kondakov. Moscow: Pedagogika, 1985.

Pirogov, N. I. “Voprosy zhizni.” In *Sochineniia N. I. Pirogova*. vol. I. Kiev: Pirogovskago t-va, 1910: 38-79.

Stroganov, S. G., “Zapiska general-ad'iutanta S. G. Stroganov po voprosu o Preobrazovanii voenno-uchebnykh zavedenii.” in *Stoletie voennogo ministerstva, 1802-1902*. Edited by D. A. Skalon (St. Petersburg, 1902), X, part III, p. 196-206.

Secondary Sources

Alston, Patrick. *Education and the State in Tsarist Russia*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1969.

- Alpatov, N. V. *Uchebno-vospitatel'naia rabota v dorevoliutsionnoi shkole internatnogo tipa*. Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe uchebno-pedagogicheskoe izdatel'stvo ministerstva prosveshcheniia, 1958.
- , "Voennye gimnazii v Rossii." *Sovetskaia Pedagogika*. (July 1945): 28-34.
- Baron, Samuel H. *Plekhanov: The Father of Russian Marxism*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1963.
- Beer, Daniel. *Renovating Russia: The Human Sciences and the Fate of Liberal Modernity, 1880-1930*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2008.
- Beskrovnyi, L. G. *Russkaia armii i flot v XIX veke*. Moscow: Nauka, 1973.
- Brooks, E. Willis. "The Russian Military Press in the Reform Era." In *Reforming the Tsar's Army: Military Innovation in Imperial Russia from Peter the Great to the Revolution*, edited by David Shimmelpenninck van der Oye and Bruce W. Menning, 107-32. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Bushnell, John. "Miliutin and the Balkan War: Military Reform vs. Military Performance." In *Russia's Great Reforms, 1855-1881*, edited by Ben Eklof, John Bushnell and Larissa Zakharova, 139-58. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1994.
- , "The Tsarist Officer Corps, 1881-1914: Customs, Duties, Inefficiency," *The American Historical Review* 86, no. 4 (1981): 753-80.
- , "Peasants in Uniform: The Tsarist Army as a Peasant Society," *The Journal of Social History* 13, no. 4 (1980): 565-76.
- Byford, Andy. "Between Literary Education and Academic Learning: the Study of Literature at Secondary School in late Imperial Russia (1860s-1880s)." *History of Education* 33, no. 6 (November 2004): 637-60.
- Chandos, John. *Boys Together: English Public Schools, 1800-1864*. London: Hutchinson, 1984.
- Engelstein, Laura. *The Keys to Happiness: Sex and the Search for Modernity in Fin-de Siecle Russia*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1992.
- Fuller, William C. *Civil-Military Conflict in Imperial Russia, 1881-1914*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985.
- Galushko, Iu. and A. Kolesnikov. *Shkola rossiiskogo ofitserstva*. Moscow: Russkii Mir, 1993.
- Gillis, John. *Youth and History: Tradition and Change in European Age Relations 1770 Present*. New York: Academic, 1974.
- Goering, Laura. "'Russian Nervousness': Neurasthenia and National Identity in Nineteenth-Century Russia." *Medical History* 47 (2003): 23-46.
- Grossman, Joan Delaney. "Rise and Decline of the 'Literary' Journal: 1880s-1917." In

- Literary Journals in Imperial Russia*, edited by Deborah A. Martinsen, 171-96. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Hans, Nicholas. *The History of Russian Educational Policy, 1701-1914*. New York: Russell, 1964.
- Holmgren, Beth, ed. *The Russian Memoir: History and Literature*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 2003.
- Howard, Deborah K. "Elite Secondary Education in Late Imperial Russia, 1881-1905." Ph.D. diss., Indiana University, 2006.
- Johnson, William. *Russia's Educational Heritage*. Pittsburg: Carnegie Institute Press, 1950.
- Jones, David R. "Forerunners of the Komsomol: Scouting in Imperial Russia." In *Reforming the Tsar's Army: Military Innovation in Imperial Russia from Peter the Great to the Revolution*, edited by David Shimmelpenninck van der Oye and Bruce W. Menning, 56-81. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- "K istorii voenno-uchebnoi reformy." *Russkaia starina* 54 (May 1887):345-66; (June 1887): 693-710.
- Kenez, Peter. "A Profile of the Prerevolutionary Officer Corps." *California Slavic Studies* 7 (1973): 121-58.
- Kipp, Jacob. "The Grand Duke Konstantin Nikolaevich and the Epoch of the Great Reforms, 1855-1866." Ph.D. diss., Pennsylvania State University, 1970.
- Lieven, Dominic. *Russia's Rulers under the Old Regime*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989.
- Lincoln, W. Bruce. *The Great Reforms: Autocracy, Bureaucracy and the Politics of Change in Imperial Russia*. DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 1990.
- Manchester, Laurie. *Holy Fathers, Secular Sons: Clergy, Intelligentsia and the Modern Self in Revolutionary Russia*. DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 2008.
- Manning, Roberta. *The Crisis of the Old Order in Russia: Gentry and Government*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1982.
- Markov, Anatolii. *Kadety i Iunkera: Russkie kadety i iunkera v mirnoe vremia i na voine*. San Francisco: Izdanie obshchee-kadetskogo ob"edineniia, 1961.
- McReynolds, Louise. *Russia at Play: Leisure Activities at the End of the Tsarist Era*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2003.
- Menning, Bruce. *Bayonets Before Bullets: The Imperial Russian Army, 1861-1914*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1992.
- Mikhailov, A. A. *Rukovodstvo voennym obrazovaniem v Rossii vo vtoroi polovine XIX –*

- nachale XX veka*. Pskov: Izdatel'stvo pskovskogo oblastnogo instituta ovysneniia kvalifikatsii rabotnikov obrazovaniia, 1999.
- Miller, Forrestt. *Dmitrii Miliutin and the Reform Era in Russia*. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1968.
- Morrissey, Susan. *Suicide and the Body Politic in Imperial Russia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Money, Tony. *Manly and Muscular Diversions: Public Schools and the Nineteenth-Century Sporting Revival*. London: Duckworth, 1997.
- Muckle, James. "The Darlington Report and Beyond: Secondary Education in Russia and its Problems—Some Eyewitnesses Relate their Experiences." In *Thomas Darlington's Report on Education in Russia*, edited by Janusz Tomiak, 34-43. London: School of Slavonic and East European Studies, 1987.
- Piskunov, A. I., ed. *Ocherki istorii shkoly i pedagogicheskoi mysli narodov SSSR: vtoraiia polovina XIX veka*. Moscow: Pedagogika, 1976.
- Reese, Roger R. *Red Commanders: A Social History of the Soviet Army Officer Corps, 1918-1991*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2005.
- Sanborn, Joshua. *Drafting the Russian Nation: Military Conscription, Total War, and Mass Politics, 1905-1925*. DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 2003.
- Seton-Watson, Hugh. *The Russian Empire, 1801-1917*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1967.
- Screen, J. E. O. *The Helsinki Yunker School, 1846-1879: A Case Study of Officer Training in the Russian Army*. Helsinki: Painokaari, 1987.
- Sinel, Allen. "Count Dmitrii Tolstoi and the Preparation of Russian School Teachers." *Canadian Slavic Studies*. 3, no. 2 (1969): 246-62.
- , *The Classroom and the Chancellery: State Educational Reform in Russia under Count Dmitry Tolstoi*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973.
- Steinberg, John W. "D. A. Miliutin's Impact on the Education of Russian Military Officers." In *The Making of Russian History: Society, Culture, and the Politics of Modern Russia*, edited by John W. Steinberg and Rex A. Wade, 23-46. Bloomington: Slavica, 2009.
- Violette, Aurele J. "The Reforms of Naval Officer Education during the Reign of Alexander II." *European Studies Review* 6, no. 4 (October 1976): 427-448.
- Wortman, Richard S. *Scenarios of Power: Myth and Ceremony in the Russian Monarchy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006.
- Wright, Donald P. "The Cultivation of Patriotism and the Militarization of Citizenship in Late Imperial Russia, 1906-1914." Ph.D. diss., Tulane University, 2001.

Zaionchkovskii, P. A. *The Russian Autocracy Under Alexander III*. Translated by David R. Jones. Gulf Breeze: Academic, 1976.

-----., *The Russian Autocracy in Crisis, 1878-1882*. Translated by Gary M. Hamburg. Gulf Breeze: Academic International, 1979.

-----., *Samoderzhavie i russkaia armiia na rubezhe XIX-XX stoletie*. Moscow: Mysl', 1973.

-----., *Voennye reformy 1860-1870 godov v Rossii*. Moscow: Moskovskii universitet, 1952.